DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 044 067 HE 001 676

AUTHOR	Romney, Miles C.; Okedara, Joseph T.
TITLE	A Report on the Programs for the Disadvantaged in the Oregon State System of Higher Education.
INSTITUTION	Oregon State System of Higher Education, Portland. Office of Academic Affairs.
PUB DATE	17 Nov 69
NOTE	109p.
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.50 HC-$5.55
DESCRIPTORS	*Compensatory Education Programs, *Disadvantaged Youth, Educationally Disadvantaged, Evaluation Criteria, *Higher Education, *Special Programs, State Colleges, State Universities, *Students
IDENTIFIERS	*Oregon

ABSTRACT

Section 1 of this report on programs for the disadvantaged in the Oregon State System of Higher Education defines the term disadvantaged and summarizes the barriers to higher education experienced by them. The next section reviews briefly the values that underlie the development of these programs and suggests some issues that must be considered in reviewing the programs for the disadvantaged. The third section reviews some of the efforts made, steps taken and mechanisms used by institutions to organize effective programs, and establishes the mechanisms for institutional evaluation of these programs. The fourth section reviews the general characteristics of State Systems Programs for the Disadvantaged. These programs are Upward Bound, the High School Equivalency Program, the Three Percent Program and the BOOST Program, and discusses the operation of these programs at the 7 state institutions involved. (AF)

ED0 44067

A REPORT ON THE PROGRAMS FOR THE DISADVANTAGED IN THE OREGON STATE SYSTEM OF HIGHER EDUCATION

Prepared for the
Oregon State Board of Higher Education
Committee on Academic Affairs
Meeting November 17, 1969, 9:00 A.M.
Room 327, Michael J. Smith Memorial Center, PSU

Mrs. Elizabeth H. Johnson, Chairman
Mr. George H. Layman
Mr. John W. Snider
Mr. Chas. R. Holloway, Jr., Alternate

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

HE001 676

Oregon State System of Higher Education

Office of Academic Affairs
November 17, 1969

ED0 44067

Prepared by

Miles C. Romney, Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs
Joseph T. Okedara, Research Associate, Office of Academic Affairs

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

A REPORT OF THE PROGRAMS FOR THE DISADVANTAGED IN OREGON STATE SYSTEM OF HIGHER EDUCATION 1

The Disadvantaged Defined 2

College and University Programs for the Disadvantaged - Values, Selected Issues, Qualifications 5

Fundamental Values Underlying Programs for the Disadvantaged 5

Education and Self-Government 6
Education and Self-Realization 7
Education and Racial and Cultural Minorities 8

Meeting and Post-Secondary Needs of Disadvantaged Students . 9

Experience of State System Institutions With Programs for the Disadvantaged 21

General Charactistics of State System Programs for the Disadvantaged 25

Upward Bound 25

Purpose of Upward Bound 25
Projects Funded in 1968-69 25
1968-69 Status of Upward Bound Programs in the State System of Higher Education 26
The Upward Bound Student 26
General Area of Service 28
Relationships to Community Action Agencies 28
Composition of Student Group Selected 28
Parental Involvement 29
Commitment of the Academic Institution Required 29
The Upward Bound Program 30
Staff for Upward Bound 31

The High School Equivalency Program 33

The Three Percent Program 34

The BOOST Program 36

The Future Financing of the BOOST Program 38

Eastern Oregon College Program for the Disadvantaged 39

Three Percent Admissions Program 39

TABLE OF CONTENTS - continued

Page

Academic Progress of Three Percent Program Students 40
Plans for 1969-70 40

The BOOST Program 41

Institutional Plans 41

Oregon College of Education Programs for the Disadvantaged 42

Three Percent Admissions Program 42

Academic Progress of Students 43
Institutional Plans 43

The BOOST Program 44

Academic Progress of BOOST Students 44
Institutional Plans 45

Oregon Technical Institute Programs for the Disdavantaged 46

The BOOST Program 46

Academic Progress of Students 46
Institutional Plans 46

Oregon State University Programs for the Disadvantaged 47

Upward Bound Program 47

Ethnic Background 47
Number of High School Students in Upward Bound Programs During School Year 47
Financing the Upward Bound Programs 48
Number Upward Bound Students Entering Post-High School Programs. 48
Basis of Admission of Upward Bound Students to Oregon State University 48
Student Financial Aid for Upward Bound Graduates Enrolled in Oregon State University 49
Academic Achievement of Upward Bound Graduates at Oregon State University 49
Special Services Provided Upward Bound Students by OSU 50

Three Percent Admissions Program 51

Ethnic Background and Resident Status 51
Academic Status at Time of Admission 51
Progress of the Three Percent Students at OSU 51
Special Assistance Given Students Admitted Under Three Percent Admissions Program 52
Financial Aid 53
Institutional Plans 54

TABLE OF CONTENTS - continued

Page

BOOST Program 55

Ethnic Background 55
Resident and Educational Status 55
Attrition 55
Academic Achievement 55
Special Services Provided BOOST Students 57
Student Financial Aid 57
Institutional Plans 57

Portland State University Programs for the Disadvantaged 58

Project Teach 58

Special Assistance to Students 59
Academic Progress of Students 61
Institutional Plans 63

Project BOOST 65

Financial Aid 65
Academic Progress 65
Institutional Plans 65

Southern Oregon College Programs for the Disadvantaged 66

Three Percent Admissions Program 66

SOC's Services to Students Admitted Under Three Percent Admissions Policy 67
Student Financial Aid 67
Problems Encountered 67

The BOOST Program 69

Progress of BOOST Students 70
General Attitude of SOC Toward BOOST 70

University of Oregon Programs for the Disadvantaged 71

Upward Bound 71

Students To Be Served in the Program 71
The Program 71
Summer Program 71
Follow-Up of Summer Program Participants 72
School-Year Program 72
"Bridging" Into the University Program 72
Student Credit Load in Upward Bound 75
Number Enrolled in Upward Bound 76
Ethnic Background of Upward Bound Students 77
Basis of Admission to University of Oregon From Upward Bound Program 78

TABLE OF CONTENTS - continued

Page

Basis of Admission of Upward Bound Students to University of Oregon 81
Resident Status of Upward Bound Students Admitted to University 81
Financial Support for the Upward Bound Program 82
Scholastic Achievement at the University 84
Institutional Plans 86

Three Percent Admissions Program 88

Academic Achievement 90
Special Services Provided Three Percent Admissions Students 92
Institutional Plans 92

High School Equivalency (HEP) Program 93

Background of Students 93
Formal Education Upon Admission 94
Duration of Training 94
Student Progress 95
Number Who Completed GED Test 96
Educational Activities of Those Who Completed the GED Test 96
Basis for Admission to HEP Students 97
Grade Point Averages Earned Toward Degree 98

BOOST Program 100

Academic Achievement 101
Institutional Plans 101

LIST OF TABLES

Page

TABLE I — CREDITS EARNED AND GRADE POINT AVERAGES ACHIEVED BY STUDENTS ADMITTED UNDER THREE PERCENT PROGRAM, 1968-69 52

TABLE II — GRADE POINT AVERAGES AND CREDITS EARNED BY STUDENTS ENROLLED IN OSU BOOST PROGRAM, 1968-69 56

TABLE III — CREDITS EARNED AND CUMULATIVE GRADE POINT AVERAGES AT PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY BY PROJECT TEACH STUDENTS 62

TABLE IV — HIGH SCHOOL GPA'S AND SAT SCORES OF PSU BOOST STUDENTS, 1968-69 65

TABLE V — NUMBER ENROLLED IN UPWARD BOUND, BY ACADEMIC STATUS AT TIME OF ENTRY, 1965-66 to 1968-69 76

TABLE VI — DISTRIBUTION OF UNIVERSITY OF OREGON UPWARD BOUND STUDENTS ACCORDING TO ETHNIC BACKGROUND, 1965-66 to 1968-69 77

TABLE VII — ENROLLMENT, RETENTION, AND WITHDRAWAL RATES OF STUDENTS ADMITTED TO THE UNIVERSITY OF OREGON FROM UPWARD BOUND PROGRAM, 1965-66 to 1968-69 79

TABLE VIII — BASIS OF ADMISSION OF THE UPWARD BOUND STUDENTS ADMITTED TO THE UNIVERSITY OF OREGON 82

TABLE IX — RESIDENT STATUS OF UPWARD BOUND STUDENTS ADMITTED TO UNIVERSITY OF OREGON 83

TABLE X — OPERATING COSTS OF THE UPWARD BOUND PROGRAM, 1965-66 to 1968-69 83

TABLE XI — STUDENT FINANCIAL AID GRANTED UPWARD BOUND STUDENTS 1965-66 to 1968-69 85

TABLE XII — CREDITS EARNED AND CUMULATIVE GRADE POINT AVERAGES OF STUDENTS ADMITTED TO UNIVERSITY OF OREGON FROM UPWARD BOUND PROGRAM 1965-66 to 1968-69 87

TABLE XIII — GRADE POINT AVERAGES AND CREDITS EARNED BY STUDENTS ENROLLED IN THE UO THREE PERCENT ADMISSIONS PROGRAM, 1968-69 91

TABLE XIV — SUMMARY DISTRIBUTION OF HEP STUDENTS BY ETHNIC BACKGROUND 93

LIST OF TABLES - continued

Page

TABLE XV SUMMARY DISTRIBUTION OF HEP STUDENTS BY AMOUNT OF FORMAL EDUCATION 94

TABLE XVI SUMMARY DISTRIBUTION OF DURATION OF TRAINING RECEIVED BY HEP STUDENTS 95

TABLE XVII CREDITS EARNED AND CUMULATIVE GRADE POINT AVERAGES AT THE UNIVERSITY OF OREGON BY FORMER HEP STUDENTS . . 98

A REPORT OF THE PROGRAMS FOR THE DISADVANTAGED IN THE OREGON STATE SYSTEM OF HIGHER EDUCATION

Colleges and universities across the land are heavily involved in the development of programs of a wide variety to serve the needs of disadvantaged youth. State system colleges and universities are no exception. They have been actively involved, particularly since the adoption by the State Board of Higher Education (effective 1968-69) of the policy permitting the institutions to admit a number of freshmen totaling no more than three percent of the institution's previous year's freshman class "who have not met the basic admission requirements."

This present report is written to provide the Board with information concerning institutional experience with these programs for the disadvantaged. The programs reported on are:

- Upward Bound (UO, OSU)
- High School Equivalency Program (UO)
- Three Percent Admissions Program (UO, OSU, PSU, SOC, OCE, EOC)
- Project BOOST (UO, OSU, PSU, SOC, OCE, EOC, OTI)

The report is organized as follows:

- The Disadvantaged Defined (pp. 2-4).
- College and University Programs for the Disadvantaged - Values, Selected Issues, Qualifications (pp. 5-20).
- Experience of State System Institutions with Programs for the Disadvantaged (pp. 21-24).
- General Characteristics of the State System Programs for the Disadvantaged (pp. 25-38).

  Eastern Oregon College
  Oregon College of Education
  Oregon Technical Institute
  Oregon State University
  Portland State University
  Southern Oregon College
  University of Oregon

The Disadvantaged Defined

The disadvantaged are described variously, although all definitions encountered by the writers have common threads running through them.

Egerton, in a report prepared for the Southern Education Foundation in April 1968, used the term "high risk" and "disadvantaged" synonomously.

> "High risk" students are those whose lack of money, low standardized test scores, erratic high school records and race/class/cultural characteristics, taken together, place them at a disadvantage in competition with the preponderant mass of students in the colleges they wish to enter. They are students who are seen as long-shot prospects for success, but who demonstrate some indefinable and unmeasurable quality - motivation, creativity, resilience, leadership, personality, or whatever - which an admissions office might interpret as a sign of strength offsetting the customary indicators of probable success.[1]

Commenting on this matter further, Egerton provides a useful backdrop against which to view the disadvantaged:

> Higher education in the United States has traditionally served an elite minority. In the beginning, when it was all private, its major function was to prepare men for the professions - law, medicine, theology. The Land-Grant College Act 100 years ago created public higher education on a broad scale and opened the doors to greater numbers of people, but even now only about half of all high-school graduates go to college, and most of them are products of the middle and upper classes of society - affluent rather than poor, white rather than black, well-schooled, tested and selected. According to the standards established by and for the prevailing American culture, they are the fittest, and they have survived. College is for them.
>
> But colleges have been flexible enough to make exceptions to these standards when it has been in their interest to do so, and they have done it with considerable success. The popularity and profitability of intercollegiate athletics have prompted hundreds of colleges and universities to admit some students whose academic and economic credentials placed them outside the winner's circle, and great effort has been expended to assure their success. Postwar foreign aid programs have financed higher education in this country for thousands of young people from overseas who brought with them differences of race, class, culture, language and

---

[1] John Egerton, Higher Education for "High Risk" Students (Atlanta: Southern Education Foundation, April, 1968), p. 7.

> academic preparation that sometimes required colleges to demonstrate considerable flexibility and adaptability in order to serve them . . .
>
> Now, racial and ethnic minorities - and the poor generally - present the American college with a similar challenge. The customary standards of admission - money, prior preparation, test scores - have effectively excluded most of them from a chance at college, and even the ones who have made it in have often succumbed to the prevailing climate they faced there.[1]

Martyn, defining the disadvantaged student in a report to the Joint Commission on Higher Education of the California Legislature, commented as follows:

> Whether he is termed culturally disadvantaged, academically disadvantaged, or socio-economically disadvantaged, essentially such a student is from a family with extremely low income, most often living in the slum areas of cities or extremely poor and isolated areas in rural communities.
>
> Where statistical data require it, we have adopted as an operational definition for such a student one who comes from a family with a gross income less than $6,000 per year. In the Preliminary Outline to this study we commented, "Disadvantaged youth has been used to describe a variety of economic indices. And it has been used as a synonym for culturally disadvantaged, educationally disadvantaged, and economically disadvantaged. For some time federal legislation used the term synonymously with those students who came from families that were economically disadvantaged in that the family income was less than $3,000 per year. Such legislation has since been modified so that individual colleges quite often may alter the definition to consider the relationship of the student to his family for support, to those also who depend on him for support, and to the other economic relationships in which the student finds himself."[2]

The barriers to higher education for the disadvantaged are defined by Martyn as including:

- Financial barriers - " . . . those matters that hinder, discourage, or prevent a student from entering higher education or remaining there successfully that are related directly or indirectly to the cost and the perception of the cost as seen by the student and his family."

- Geographic barriers - " . . . those matters that hinder, reduce, or prevent a student from entering or completing successfully higher education by virtue of the geographic location of himself, his home, and/or the college. We would include in this category problems of transportation, housing, the availability of study space, and the time and distance from the student's living and/or study quarters to the campus or classroom."

---

[1] John Egerton, "High Risk: Five Looks," Southern Education Report, April, 1968, pp. 25-26.

[2] Kenneth A. Martyn, Increasing Opportunities for Disadvantaged Students: Final Report (Sacramento: A Report to the Joint Committee on Higher Education, California Legislature), pp. 11-12.

- Motivational barriers - " . . . those sociological and psychological matters that hinder, reduce, or prevent the student from entering higher education, that relate to his personal drive, self-confidence, or perspective of himself as an achiever or potential achiever. By and large, they refer to all those psychological matters that are essentially internalized in preventing a student from attempting and persisting in his efforts to enter and remain successfully in college. 'Motivational barriers are present in a number of different contexts. If greater numbers of disadvantaged persons are to be brought into college programs of every variety, then they must be motivated to complete high school programs and develop an expectation of success. Solution to this problem is perhaps most difficult. ITs difficulty is clear when it is noted that the educational institution itself may be viewed with suspicion and distrust by many of the minority groups.'"

- Academic barriers - " . . . all those matters that relate most directl to the student's academic achievement and his academic skills. Included here are such things as his reading and writing skills, the subject matter that forms a prerequisite for his accomplishment in college subject matter, his skills in using the typical academic tools of learning . . . 'Among the most formidable barriers to increasing opportunities in higher education for disadvantaged youth is that group of obstacles frequently labeled academic. This rubric includes those problems which are related to admissions requirements, language ability, entrance tests, prerequisites to courses, general education requirements, and remedial or "bone head" courses. The admissions requirements of the State Colleges now place directly or indirectly very heavy emphasis on language ability through the aptitude test scores and the grades in high schoo subjects. Similarly, the University of California entrance requirements place heavy emphasis on those aspects of language facility that affect academic aptitude. Increasingly, the Junior Colleges are using academic aptitude tests with heavy emphasis on verbal ability to "stream" or divert students to special programs. Clearly the student's facility with language is a very basic part of the necessary equipment for him to take advantage of opportunities in higher education in California today.'"[1]

The foregoing barriers are to be found in various combinations in Oregon, militating against many individuals' having effective access to post-secondary educational opportunities.

As we shall see in our later examination of the programs for the disadvantaged in the institutions of the state system, the programs seek in varying degrees to assist the student to surmount the particular barriers that are to him the roadblock to higher education.

We turn now to a description of the general character of the various programs for the disadvantaged in the state system institutions.

---

[1] *Ibid.*, pp. 13-14.

College and University Programs for the Disadvantaged - Values, Selected Issues, Qualifications

Feelings run deep where some social policy questions are concerned. The more so now - when social criticism is as pronounced and discontent so vigorously expressed.

College and university programs for the disadvantaged, the subject of this present report, are an expression of social policy that has stimulated widespread discussion and some differences of opinion on certain aspects.

There is virtually no disagreement as to the importance of the fundamental values that these programs seek to serve. Such differences in view as exist tend, rather, to cluster around such broad questions as:

- Are the kinds of programs for the disadvantaged which the colleges and universities have established the most effective of the possible alternative mechanisms for serving the needs of the disadvantaged?
- What kinds of measures are appropriate to use in assessing the success of these programs?
- What kinds of qualifications must be borne in mind in assessing the success of the programs for the disadvantaged?

We should like in this section of the report to review briefly the values that underlie the development of these programs, and then to lay before the board some of the matters that should be borne in mind in reviewing the programs for the disadvantaged in our Oregon institutions.

Fundamental Values Underlying Programs for the Disadvantaged

At the near beginning of America's active role as a combatant in the second world war, a group of educators issued a public document setting forth their views as to the meaning and the purposes of the education of free men in American democracy.[1]

Written at the nadir of the Allies' fortunes, it was in a sense a call to battle for the defense and realization of what the authors referred to as the "noble and lofty conceptions of the nature and destiny of man." As a young and impressionable graduate student enrolled in classes with a number of the authors, I was moved by the sweep of their vision and the eloquence with which they spoke. Nor have the almost 30 years that have intervened clouded my memory of the exhilaration their words brought in a time when pessimism was a part of the air we breathed.

---

[1] Educational Policies Commission, The Education of Free Men in American Democracy (Washington, D.C.: Educational Policies Commission, 1941).

They spoke of democracy as a great social faith. Of it they said:

> . . . It is the finest of all the social faiths that mankind has fashioned and followed during the thousands of years of human history. It is incomparably finer than the totalitarian rivals with which it is engaged in struggle for survival today. It is a social faith that, in spite of the darkness which now seems to be settling over much of the world, will in the course of time conquer the earth. And it will conquer, not by force of arms and the use of terror, but by the power of its ideas and its hopes. It will conquer because it is the only social faith that can bring justice and mercy to all men.[1]

The articles of the democratic faith had never been codified, they said. But their substance was to be found "in the carefully preserved sayings and writings of the great prophets and seers . . . the fugitive utterances and letters of ordinary men and women . . . customs and institutions . . . in the public school, the Bill of Rights, courts of justice, representative legislatures, system of law, and ethical codes."[2]

From these strands the authors wove a statement of the articles of the democratic faith:

> First, the individual human being is of surpassing worth
> Second, the earth and human culture belong to all men
> Third, men can and should rule themselves
> Fourth, the human mind can be trusted and should be set free
> Fifth, the method of peace is superior to that of war
> Sixth, racial, cultural, and political minorities should be tolerated, respected, and valued.[3]

Nothing that has transpired since would seem to challenge the wisdom reflected in these articles of faith. They speak to the fundamental values that underlie the programs for the disadvantaged in the state system of higher education, and the heightened concern generally felt in society for the plight of the disadvantaged. As a backdrop against which to consider the later discussion of these programs, we should like here to comment briefly on a number of the foregoing articles and their relation to education.

Education and Self-Government

"Popular government," our Founding Fathers proclaimed, "without the means of popular enlightenment is the prologue to a tragedy or a farce or both." This thought, expressed in so many elegant ways by our early American progenitors, is akin to the sentiment expressed a half-century later by an Englishman in his testament to the effect that "education makes a people easy to lead, difficult to drive, and impossible to enslave."

The fight to build in this country a system of education worthy of our forbears' visions has been long and arduous - and never-ending. More than 130 years has been consumed in our efforts to establish a system of free, universal public schools and to keep them free politically, economically, and intellectually. And the battle is not yet won - nor will it ever be, finally and completely.

---

[1] *Ibid*, p. 33.
[2] *Ibid*.
[3] *Ibid*.

Education and Self-Realization

Ours is a free society committed to the concept of the realization of individual potentialities. In this commitment, education is the chief instrument of our policy. We see education as Horace Mann did, as being ". . . beyond all other devices of human origin . . . the great equalizer of the conditions of man . . . It does better than to disarm the poor of their hostility toward the rich; it prevents being poor."

When Abraham Lincoln, a contemporary of Horace Mann's, spoke of the need to give every man "an open field and a fair chance," he was expressing an 1852 version of the American dream. Four generations later, Thomas Wolfe put it in these words:

> . . . to every man his chance - to every man, regardless of his birth, his shining, golden opportunity - to every man the right to live, to work, to be himself, and to become whatever thing his manhood and his vision can combine to make him, this . . . is the promise of America.

In the 1960's, the American Educational Policies Commission paid its respects to the ideal of self-realization by suggesting in a discussion of universal education beyond the high school that:

> A person cannot justly be excluded from further education unless his deficiencies are so severe that even the most flexible and dedicated institution could contribute little to his mental development. . . . In the future, the important question needs to be not "Who deserves not to be admitted?" but "Whom can society, in conscience and self-interest exclude?"

Such an ideal has relevance only in the context of differentiated educational opportunities readily available to the people of the state. For, since men are not equal in their abilities, potentialities, interests any more than they are all of equal height, it requires a wide variety of educational opportunities, formal and informal, to meet the varying abilities and interests of our people.

Beyond the availability of such differentiated educational opportunities, there must be a willingness on the part of students to make their choice from among the variety of post-high school educational opportunities on the basis of their abilities and interests rather than in terms of some false sense of prestige which too often has prompted individuals to seek entry into programs for which they are not equipped and in which they cannot succeed.

As we shall later note, it is on this issue that some have leveled criticism at the programs for academically disadvantaged students in the four-year colleges and universities. The question they raised is whether those students selected for admission to the university might be better served in some other institution having different aims and purposes than the university.

Education and Racial and Cultural Minorities

Poverty and inadequate education are closely related in American life. Evidence is that the poor tend to get an inferior education, and those with an inferior education tend to suffer in the competition for a share of the economic returns of our society. Particularly does this seem to be true among the racial and cultural minorities - Blacks, American Indians, Mexican Americans, Puerto Ricans - where poverty and inadequate education are found disproportionately.

The mounting concern over the plight of these minorities, and of the disadvantaged generally, stems from the feeling that the fault lies not with the minorities but with society which has placed in their path what the U. S. Chamber of Commerce has referred to as "disproportionate economic and social obstacles" which continue to "deny them the opportunity to achieve their full potential in our society." This is the inevitable conclusion to be drawn from the continued subnormal economic performance of these minorities, says the Chamber, unless one accepts the unpalatable premise that minority Americans are inferior.

Thus it is that on every hand there are evidences in American life of a willingness to seek out the barriers that stand in the way of these minorities and to clear them away. This can be justified on purely altruistic grounds, but it can also be justified in terms of hard-headed economic theories as the United States Chamber of Commerce has indicated:

> The Task Force /U. S. Chamber of Commerce/ has noted that a free economy works best when all its participants are provided equal access to essential social goods. Of these social goods, education is among the most important. Education is necessary to prepare the minority poor to take advantage of the opportunities a fair and efficient free economy presents. If we wish to help achieve maximum productivity by providing full and fair educational opportunities for all Americans, then our public educational institutions should be designed to do that job as effectively as possible.[1]

Evidences of interest in the removal of these barriers that confront the minority groups is seen on every hand -

- in labor and industry, where admission of minority racial groups into crafts and trades, and administrative posts formerly closed to them, or being opened to them.

- government, where minority groups are increasingly represented in positions formerly never held by them.

---

[1] United States Chamber of Commerce, Task Force on Economic Growth and Opportunity, The Disadvantaged Poor: Education and Employment (Washington, D.C.: The Chamber, 1966), p. 26.

- education, where institutions and programs at all levels vigorously recruit from minority groups.

These instincts that drive us to open wide the doors of opportunity to the disadvantaged generally, and to the minority racial and cultural groups in particular, flow from the deepest well-springs of our democratic faith. They are, in a way, an expression of the strength of the democratic society which is, in the words of the Rockefeller report, "the declared enemy of every condition that stunts the intellectual, moral, and spiritual growth of the individual." "No society has ever fully succeeded in living up to the stern ideals that a free people set themselves," the report continues. "But only a free society can even address itself to that demanding task," the report concludes.[1]

The self-corrective aspects of our efforts accord with the finest traditions of the democratic ideal. I was reminded of this fact in reading again recently a statement from Czechoslovakia published in the New York Times September 25, 1937, just prior to the downfall of that country and the beginning of the second world war:

> Our country might conceivably be overwhelmed by superior military force, but our democracy will never be imperiled by outside attacks. Democracy is always weakened from within. Only its own feebleness or complacency destroys it. We in Europe see more clearly than you that democracy dies from lack of discipline, unwillingness to compromise, group pressure, corruption, usurpation of public power because the public is greedy or indifferent. It dies unless it draws life from every citizen. Denouncing dictators gets nowhere. The job of those who believe in the democratic process is to be positive, not negative, to build it up, expose and correct its mistakes, keep it alive.[2]

Few will argue with our efforts to live up to the articles of the democratic faith through the programs we are providing for the disadvantaged. But there may be some honest differences of opinion as to how effective these programs are and as to whether there are alternative ways of achieving more effectively what these programs are presumably designed to do. These matters we will refer to in succeeding sections of this report.

Meeting the Post-Secondary Needs Of Disadvantaged Students

When the disadvantaged are defined as broadly as they are in the preceding section of this report (pp. 2-4) to include those hindered by any one or more of the following barriers: financial, geographic, motivation, or academic.

---

[1] Rockefeller Brothers Foundation, Pursuit of Excellence - Education and the Future of America (Garden City, N. J.: Doubleday and Company, Inc., 1958), p. 1.

[2] New York Times, September 25, 1937, reprinted in Educational Policies Commission, The Purposes of Education in American Democracy (Washington, D.C.: Educational Policies Commission, 1938), p. 109.

it is clear that a wide range of educational opportunities is necessary to their needs. For the disadvantaged, thus defined, will encompass young people of widely varying abilities, interests, and potentialities.

- For some disadvantaged students only the most rigorous academic program at the post-secondary level, leading into graduate work or professional training at the post-baccalaureate level, will serve.
- At the other end of the continuum, some disadvantaged students will find their needs met in a formal two-year program in a vocational-technical field or in the liberal arts, or perhaps even by informal learning opportunities such as on-the-job or apprenticeship training.

But the fact that such a range of offerings is physically in being in the public and independent sectors of Oregon's educational world does not imply that these educational resources are accessible to the disadvantaged. Almost by definition they are not. For the disadvantaged are so-called because they are hindered by one or more barriers that deny them post-secondary education. If, therefore, these resources are to be effectively available to the disadvantaged, steps must be taken to overcome the barriers that stand in the way:

- If the barrier is financial, financial support for the student must be found.
- If the barrier is geographic, ways must be found to bring the student and the educational opportunity in proximity one to the other.
- If the barrier is motivation, then the student - and perhaps his parents - must be motivated in some fashion.
- If the barrier is academic, means must be found either to help the student prepare himself to qualify for admission through the usual admission channels, or some provision must be made to admit those students who appear to have promise even though they do not meet formal admission requirements.

The disadvantaged admitted to the state system institutions vary in the range and number of barriers faced in seeking a college education.

- Some are multiply disadvantaged. They lack financial support, they may need motivation, their academic qualifiactions measured in the traditional terms of high school grade point average or scholastic aptitude score may be below the institution's admission requirements.
- Some are highly motivated, can meet the admission requirements, but lack necessary financial support.
- Some have adequate financial support, but cannot meet the regular admission requirements.

Of these barriers, it is perhaps the academic barrier that has occasioned the most discussion. This discussion centers around a number of questions, as illustrated on the following page.

1. Given the relatively modest character of the academic admission requirements of state system institutions, is a student who cannot meet them likely to have the verbal and academic qualifications that will permit him to benefit from the programs available?

Those who raise this question point out that the admission requirements in the state system institutions are quite modest, and that they are stated in three different ways in order to open to students a variety of ways for meeting admission requirements.

- The high school grade point average (GPA) required is 2.25 for the fall term in four of the institutions, and 2.00 in the other three. It is 2.00 for all seven institutions in the winter and spring terms.
- Those who cannot qualify for admission on the basis of high school GPA may qualify on the basis of either of two other measures:
    - A score of 887 on the scholastic aptitude test for the fall term in four institutions and a score of 880 for three institutions. The minimum required score for all seven institutions in the winter and spring terms is 880 (of a possible score of 1,600).
    - For those who can qualify for admission on neither the GPA nor the scholastic aptitude score, there is opportunity to qualify on the basis of college work attempted. Oregon students who can earn a "C" average in nine hours of prescribed college-level summer study, or in twelve hours of regular college-level work in an approved program also qualify for regular admission to any of the state system schools.

The response given is that the admissions requirements are phrased in traditional terms and seek to measure achievement of students under conditions that in many instances were inimical to effective study, that by wise selection of students, and effective assistance, these students can succeed at the collegiate level in the kinds of programs offered in the state system and that to deny them an opportunity to try is to ascribe to our admissions measures a validity that they do not have.

2. Are there other educational institutions or agencies better equipped to satisfy the post-secondary school needs of those students who cannot meet the modest threshold admissions requirements of the state system institutions?

This question is raised by some out of a concern as to whether the minimizing of scholastic aptitude and ability, as traditionally measured, as a basis for admission, may work an adverse change in the character of the four-year institutions. Universities cannot remain universities in any real sense, they argue, if they must now take on the responsibility of educating large segments of the population incapable of meeting what are, by any measure, modestly selective admissions requirements such as the state system institutions have.

Those who raise this question appeal to the validity of the concept of differentiation of function among educational institutions in Oregon. There must, they argue, be a diversity of function among educational institutions within the state if the diverse needs of Oregon's population are to be adequately served. And there can be true excellence in our institutions, they assert, only to the degree that this diversity of function is maintained and the unique character of each type institution is reflected in its admission requirements and its programs.

It is not that those who raise this question are opposed to the view that the post-high school educational needs of the disadvantaged should be served. It is only that they question whether those individuals who cannot meet the modest admission standards characteristic of the state system institutions can be effectively served in the universities without the universities altering fundamentally their objectives and the unique characteristics which distinguish them from the community colleges. Is it not one of the functions of the community colleges to serve the needs of those students who cannot demonstrate adequate verbal aptitude, through the traditional means, to meet the modest admission standards now in effect in the state system? they ask.

- Community colleges are "open door" institutions. They serve any one over age 18 irrespective of previous academic record. They offer to the student the opportunity to perform and in performing to demonstrate his capacity to perform academically. Such performance test is superior to any tests thus far devised for measuring capacity for academic performance. It is precisely because of this characteristic that community colleges have sometimes been referred to facetiously as "last chance" colleges.

- Community colleges seem uniquely fitted to serving the needs of the disadvantaged, for still other reasons. They offer a wide choice of curricula ranging from a substantial number of vocational-technical programs to college transfer programs which are articulated with the programs offered in the four-year institutions. A student may thus test himself against the demands of several programs, if necessary to his "finding" himself, or he may, if necessary, enter an appropriate remedial program without danger of being discharged from the college, returning later to the program of his choice.

  This planned flexibility in program try-out is a partial explanation of the emphasis placed upon counseling and guidance in the community colleges.

Why, then, not leave to the community colleges the primary responsibility for serving the needs of those students who desire to enter a public college or university but who cannot meet the regular admission requirements of the four-year institution?

The response is multiple.

- Most Oregon community colleges lack dormitory facilities, hence, there is no way for the community college to lift the disadvantaged student out of the environment and background out of which he comes, which has generally been considered to be a principal cause for his poor academic record. At the four-year institutions, on the other hand, dormitory facilities are readily available in which a living environment can be created that the institution feels is likely to give the student the maximum chance to succeed.

  Even though some would argue that special housing provisions could be made for the academically disadvantaged attending the community colleges, the fact remains that the community colleges are not intended as residential institutions. To provide at the community college living facilities for all of the academically disadvantaged students attending would constitute a major change in direction and necessitate capital outlays which it is doubtful could be amortized from dormitory fees as is true of the dormitories at the four-year schools, unless, of course, a much more extensive program of state and federal aid to students were instituted.

- Refusal to admit academically disadvantaged students into the four-year institutions would be seen as a lack of concern on the part of these institutions in the problems of the academically disadvantaged.

  Assurance that post-secondary educational opportunities are readily available at the community colleges, and that transfer from the community colleges into the four-year institutions is easily effected for those who demonstrate academic potential, seems only to confirm the disadvantaged in their feeling that there is a conspiracy to close to them the preparation that will open opportunity at the highest levels.

  It should surprise no one that academically disadvantaged students should desire admission into the four-year colleges and universities. Some view this desire as an expression of status consciousness as it is thought to be for many other students, who make the assumption that the four-year college or university and the liberal arts college, or any of the two-year college programs, particularly vocational-technical programs. For there is among a wide range of American society an unfortunate confusion of the meaning of excellence in education. It assumes that the concept of institutional excellence is somehow appropriate only to four-year colleges and universities. This misunderstanding has led many young people and their parents to insist that only a university education can be a quality education.

  But to the academically disadvantaged student from a disadvantaged background, it is much more than a matter of status.

Four-year colleges and universities are seen as the route to maximum upward mobility. And although the community college is, for many students, a route into the four-year colleges and universities and the maximum upward mobility they represent, to many academically disadvantaged this route into the four-year colleges and universities is suspect.

- There are many faculty and students who feel that the four-year institutions need a student mix which includes academically disadvantaged students in order to provide a realistic, challenging learning environment for the student body. Such realism - the facing and dealing with the real problems of the real world - is an important aspect of a meaningful educational experience in our times, it is urged. Institutional self-interest, if nothing else, would oblige the four-year institutions to recruit from among the academically disadvantaged students, it is said.

- The problems posed by the academically disadvantaged, particularly among the minority ethnic groups of America, is of such national significance that the four-year colleges and universities simply cannot ignore it, it is urged. The academically disadvantaged are found in disproportionate numbers among the minority groups - Blacks, Mexican Americans, Indians, Puerto Ricans - and the four-year institutions simply cannot be indifferent to their problems. It should be noted in this connection that with the present active interest on every hand in the problems of minority groups, the competition among colleges and universities in recruiting the young people who have the traditional academic credentials for college admission is brisk. As someone has said, there are simply not enough such young people to satisfy the demand.

- The fear that the admission of academically disadvantaged into the four-year colleges and universities will impair the standards of these institutions is not shared by all who are acquainted with these programs as they have developed across the country. One of these, John Egerton, who reported in April 1968 on experience with the disadvantaged, observed that:

> Colleges which do in fact try to exercise flexibility do not do it at the expense of their existing academic standards; concessions are made to get "different" students in, but not to let them out.[1]

In the same vein, the board of admissions of one of the large western institutions has provided for flexibility in admissions standards in admitting students to a special educational program designed for those unable to meet the institution's regular

---

[1] John Egerton, Higher Education for "High Risk" Students (Atlanta, Georgia; Southern Education Foundation, April, 1968), p. 49.

> admissions requirements with the observation that those admitted are to be given the opportunity ultimately to graduate "under normal University requirements." [Underscoring added.]

In sum, it does indeed appear that the objectives of the community colleges and the needs of the academically disadvantaged are uniquely well-suited to each other. It would also seem that if the four-year institutions are to meet the needs of those students, they will need to work assiduously to provide them with the special kinds of help without which many of them will not survive academically.

3. Under what conditions ought institutions to admit the academically disadvantaged students who do not meet regular admissions requirements?

By definition, the students admitted to institutions without meeting regular admissions requirements are deficient in the traditional evidence of linguistic and verbal ability that are associated with success in college or university programs.

Without reasonable facility with language and a reasonable level of verbal ability, it is difficult to see how students can take advantage of the opportunities that a four-year college or university has to offer. It follows then that when students who lack evidence of these traditional resources are admitted to a four-year institution, one or both of two assumptions is being made: (1) either that the necessary verbal facility can be developed through special help and attention which the institution intends to provide the student, or (2) the objectives and the character of the institution can be changed so as to make verbal and linguistic ability less important to collegiate success than they now are.

There are some advocates of the expanded admission of academically disadvantaged who accept both of the above premises. On the one hand, they believe that if the institution is committed to its obligation to serve the academically disadvantaged, it will provide the special kinds of instructional and counseling helps that will enable the student to overcome some of the shortcomings under which he labors by reason of his previous academic experience. On the other hand, they expect that the institution's programs will be modified as a concession to relevancy and that this modification will result in less emphasis being placed on verbal aptitude and ability. It is their view that the programs offered in the colleges and universities are irrelevant to the needs of the times and that if they are made more relevant, verbal aptitude and ability will be seen to be far less important to success than it appears presently to be.

It seems apparent to the board's office that the decision of the institutions to admit academically disadvantaged students is a commitment to make special provisions to recognize the handicaps these students labor under and to help them remedy these deficiencies so as to be able to take full advantage of the educational opportunities the institutions have to offer. Typical of the kinds of provisions to be made are:

a. Remedial programs and remedial training to assist the student to develop the linguistic and verbal skills necessary to his benefitting fully from what the institutions have to offer.

b. Tutoring assistance.

c. Adequate counseling help.

d. Perhaps some special concessions initially, in terms of a modification of the institution's standards of retention, to allow the student a reasonable time in which to adjust to the academic environment.

e. Financial assistance in those instances in which the student's resources are inadequate to his requirements as a student.

Remedial Programs. Most programs for the academically disadvantaged make the assumption that remedial programs and remedial training can do much to enable the academically disadvantaged to develop the linguistic skills (i.e., writing, speaking, and reading) which are lacking at the time of their admission. But where deficiencies are substantial, only a remedial program of remarkable effectiveness can hope in two or three quarters of work to accomplish what the public schools have failed to accomplish in twelve years.

Martyn reports that in California some institutions have used a "combination of remedial courses, special counseling, and make-up work in academic subjects." "The goal of such work," he says, "has been to prepare students for entrance into the transfer program." He reports that experience in California with remedial programs generally, with the combination of remedial courses, special counseling and make-up work in academic subjects, has shown that success "is very small."

It will be noted in the review of the state system experience, the institutions have varied in the extent to which they have provided special remedial programs for the academically disadvantaged.

Tutoring. Special tutoring of the academically disadvantaged is an essential service if they are to have the maximum chance to succeed. As we shall note in later sections of this report, volunteer tutors have in some instances played a significant role. In some instances, individuals who themselves came into the institution as academically disadvantaged students are reported to have proven helpful in providing tutorial assistance.

An interesting commentary on the importance of tutoring comes to us from the University of Wisconsin experience,[1] described as follows:

> . . . In an effort not to be too discouraging to the students who entered the /high risk/ program in 1966, Mrs. Doyle did not emphasize the academic handicaps they had in relation to the rest of the freshman class. As a result, some of the students bitterly resented any suggestion that they needed tutorial assistance. Although every effort was made not to identify them as a special group or as individuals receiving special attention, their own realization of their need for help was confusing, embarrassing, and even infuriating to some.

---

[1] John Egerton, op. cit., p. 28.

> This year [1967-68], it was emphasized repeatedly in correspondence and interviews with the second group of students that they would have a decided academic handicap, although they were assured by Mrs. Doyle of her confidence that they could succeed with special academic assistance. "You have to be realistic," she now says, "You can't fool them. They have to know where they stand."

Wisconsin's experience is reported to be that:

> . . . without lowering its standards, changing its requirements for degrees or even altering the rules for academic probation and dismissal, the university has accepted a group of students who were strangers to the campus culture and poor bets for success, and achieved a better retention record with them than with the freshman class as a whole.

Counseling. If counseling is important to the general run of students in our institutions, it is indispensable to the academically disadvantaged. Our sampling of the experience of students admitted to the state system institutions confirms the value that these students place upon adequate counseling help.

Standards for Retention. Recognizing the difficulty disadvantaged students have in making up their linguistic and other deficiencies, institutions not uncommonly temper their standards for retention to give these students every benefit of the doubt. For instance, a University of Californi- (Berkeley) official, at a symposium sponsored by the College Entrance Examination Board, reported that all of these students admitted to the university are retained following their first quarter, irrespective of the level of their performance. They are retained following the second quarter "if they show any improvement." Finally, he reported, "in the third quarter we have found that most achieve on an average or better level."[1]

Whatever the effort required to bring special help to academically disadvantaged students admitted, it must be made. For to admit students deficient in the tools requisite to success in the institution without a serious, organized, systematic effort to bring special help to them is to invite failure both of the individual and of the program. The impact upon the student of further failure, piled atop earlier academic disappointments, can be devastating to the individual's self-esteem. To raise the individual's hopes and then to permit them to be dashed without the most vigorous efforts to help him to succeed is scarcely an act of compassion.

---

[1] Statewide Seminar on Race and Poverty in Higher Education, Summary and Proceedings (Sponsored by the California Council for Educational Opportunity, Inc., and the College Entrance Examination Board, February 29, 1968).

It is a concern for what failure in this college experience may mean to the disadvantaged student, already surfeited with failure experiences in school, that leads some critics of the present programs to question the wisdom of admitting students who have serious linguistic and verbal deficiencies. Why not, they ask, establish more effective regular and remedial programs in the public schools and community colleges and then admit into the four-year colleges or universities only those students whose linguistic and verbal skills appear to be at a level necessary to college success. Such a program of remedial help and of admission on the basis of demonstrated qualifications would speak to the real needs of the disadvantaged quite as much as do the present programs and with much greater efficiency, they urge.

This is the view taken by Bruno Bettelheim, professor of psychology and psychiatry at the University of Chicago, who describes his rationale in a recent article. Although he expresses his views in terms of a particular ethnic group, he might have used any one of several other ethnic groups equally well. Hence, to put the matter in general terms, I shall substitute in the quotation below the term "ethnic minority" for the ethnic group Bettelheim referred to.

> But here the difficulty is that many [ethnic minority] students just because of the nature of the commitment of the university do not feel that being a student is necessarily the best way for them to find their rightful place in society. Here our wish and theirs, that they should become part of the elite, runs afoul of what for many of them is their reality. Many of the [ethnic minority] students who are brought into our colleges are often ill-prepared academically, and lacking in the skills required for making a go in college . . .
>
> While the faculty is ready to make allowances for this, it runs counter to the self-respect of the [ethnic minority] student, who rightly does not wish to be made to feel like a second-class citizen. But if he cannot compete successfully with those students who had had so many advantages educationally and socially, he is in a terrible conflict. He was brought to college to do as well as the others, but if he fails to do so, his background does not permit him to accept that this is because of his lack of preparation, because this would make him feel second-class, while he is in college to get out of such a position.
>
> So, when because of lack of background and preparation - though intellectually able to make the grade - he has difficulty in adjusting, he feels that the very place that promised to make him equal fails to do so. Disappointed, he rages against the institution that makes him once more feel inferior. And efforts to help him by means of special programs only makes this inferiority even more obvious.
>
> . . . .
>
> I believe the answer to this problem does not rest with the colleges and the universities.

> If we want to bring a large number of [ethnic minority] students into our universities, as we should, I am convinced we have to start much earlier. I believe from high-school age on, it would be necessary to educate a larger number of them, together with [other] youngsters from culturally deprived backgrounds, in true prep schools, so that they will enter college in every respect as well prepared academically and socially as the rest of the college population.[1]

Whatever view one takes with respect to Bettelheim's proposal, or the contrary views described earlier in this report, on one thing there is near unanimity, namely that pressures are mounting for the four-year colleges and universities to open up admission to young people of minority races or groups who do not meet the usual admission requirements of the institution.

As one university president put it this past summer:

> I firmly believe that the problem of admitting and supporting disadvantaged students from minority groups is one of the most pressing problems facing this institution in the years ahead, and similar pressures will build in other institutions . . . In my judgment, it is better at this stage to err in the direction of taking considerable risks in admitting students from minority groups than to hold fast to our academic judgment as to what is possible in overcoming their educational disadvantage. We may be wrong. At the same time we are urging our student minority leaders to cooperate in their recruiting of students for admission . . . and to encourage those students whose motivation and background seem to give them reasonable assurance of ultimate success. We will have our failures and we will have to learn through experimentation, but the problems we will face if we do not take positive action to the limit of our ability will be far greater.

This concern is not unique to the four-year colleges and universities. The same concerns are companion to other educational agencies such as the medical schools, as may be seen from an article entitled "Implications of Educational Change for Certification for Practice," by Cheves McC. Smythe, M. D., associate director of the Association of American Medical Colleges, who, in an article printed in the *Federation Bulletin* issued by the Federal-State Medical Boards in March 1969, said in summing up his recommendations:

> The second recommendation: *Medical Schools must admit increased numbers of students from geo-groups, that are now inadequately represented*. In plain terms, this means blacks, Puerto Ricans, Indians, Mexican-Americans, and the lower 30 percent on the

---

[1] Bruno Bettelheim, "Too Many Misfits in College: What Congress is Told," *U. S. News and World Report*, April 17, 1969, p. 63.

> economic ladder in the white groups. With the incremental number of students recommended, the necessity to accomplish an important increment of opportunity for education in medicine should be even more readily apparent. Of course, this immediately brings up the question of how committees escape the dilemma of compromising quality with quotas.

Later in his statement of recommendations, Smythe calls upon the medical schools "to individualize the education of the physician to fit the students' varying rates of achievement, various educational backgrounds, and differing career goals." "This," he says, "is clearly a call for multiple track or multiple elective curricula. The concept of a standard medical school curriculum and a standardized graduate from medical school is archaic and wasteful." Speaking again to the problems of the disadvantaged he then says: "For those students who have limitations in their educational backgrounds, but possess the personal and intellectual qualifications that are deemed appropriate for medicine, tutorial support should be provided while they are in medical school. Unless this is done, the de facto discrimination against educational opportunities for members of deprived groups will continue, which is an intolerable conclusion."

Experience of State System Institutions With Programs for the Disadvantaged

As we shall note in greater detail in succeeding sections of this report, the state system institutions are involved in programs for the disadvantaged on a modest basis, compared with the extent and range of programs available in some state-supported institutions elsewhere. In our report of little more than a year ago (Admission Policies, 1969-70, Oregon State System of Higher Education, July 2, 1968), we presented data suggesting the extent of the commitment of some of the publicly-supported California institutions to working with the disadvantaged.

This is not to denigrate what our institutions have done. A beginning has been made. And the Board has played a significant role in encouraging institutions along this line. The Board's March 12, 1968 authorization of the institutions to enter upon an experimental program under which they would be authorized, effective with 1968-69, to admit a number of freshmen totaling no more than three percent of the institution's previous year's freshman class as calculated by the Board's office, gave impetus to our institutions in their work in this field.

Prior to the Board's action, two of the state system institutions had become actively involved in the Upward Bound program (described pp. 25-32). One institution had launched a high school equivalency program (described pp. 33-35), all were involved in the project BOOST program (described pp. 36-38) which had been launched under the guidance of a team working out of the office of high school relations of the Board's office.

In this present report, we seek to provide some information about institutional experience with the foregoing programs. It is not an easy task. A comprehensive evaluation would involve our speaking at some length concerning each of the programs and each of the institutions in terms of many facets of their operation of which the following are only illustrative.

- The mechanisms and criteria by means of which the institutions have sought to recruit promising young people from disadvantaged groups.

- The extent and the nature of the efforts the institution has made to provide what someone has described as a "comfortable, accepting situation and climate which, particularly in the case of the visibly different student, minimizes the extent to which they are made to feel as though they are rejected or on display."

- The extent, the nature, and the effectiveness of the steps that the institution has taken to provide the disadvantaged student with the special kinds of services which those who are academically disadvantaged need if they are to have any chance at success?

- The steps taken by the institutions to provide the disadvantaged students with the special kind of counseling that he needs if he is to succeed - counseling which concerns itself not along with academic matters, but which seeks to assist the student with those personal and behavioral problems with which society may seem to confront him.

- The efforts of the institution to assess the effectiveness of its work with the disadvantaged student and the steps it has taken to improve its effectiveness.

- The steps taken by the institution to give some assurance that disadvantaged students from minority ethnic groups are being given equal access to the institution's resources.

What we have done is to speak briefly about some of these matters with no pretense to an encyclopedic analysis and presentation. Before compiling such a report, we wish to give the institutions an opportunity to gain additional experience with these programs and to establish the mechanisms for institutional evaluation of these programs as we recommend on the following page.

Now an important word as to the data presented with respect to the academic achievement of students in the programs here described and the way in which we hope the Board will view these data. We were faced with the question as to what evidence should be accepted as to the academic success the disadvantaged students experienced in our colleges and institutions. Grade point averages and credit hours completed have been the traditional measures used by institutions to measure student progress academically. In some quarters these measures are now under attack as being "irrelevant" to the needs of the academically disadvantaged students. Yet, as long as there are no better measures of the institution's assessment of the individual's achievement, this is certainly one important measure that bears examination in assessing student achievement.

And we have used it, recognizing its limitations. But in using it, we would urge that the Board not draw hasty conclusions on the basis of this limited evidence as to the efficacy of the programs now under way with the academically disadvantaged. Experimentation takes time - and patience. And usually some false starts.

These programs are barely under way. Moreover, although grade records are available, there is much information that is not. For instance, consider the matter of those disadvantaged students admitted to our institutions who subsequently leave because of academic deficiencies or for some other reason. The institutions have no record as to what became of the student. They do not know whether he entered some other college or school. They do not know to what employment he went. They do not know whether he will, after a term or two, or a year or so, return for further work. What they do know is only that he left the institution and whether or not his leaving was voluntary.

We would emphasize that the institutions - which are closest to the scene - have, without exception, expressed a desire to move ahead with their experimentation with programs for the disadvantaged. We recommend to the Board that they be encouraged to do so, and that they be supported in that effort.

But in continuing experimentation with these programs, the institutions take on two very important obligations:

- The obligation to provide the disadvantaged student (particularly the academically disadvantaged) the kinds of special help (i.e., remedial programs where needed, tutorial help, special counseling, and the like) that are essential to his having the fullest possible opportunity to succeed. To bring academically disadvantaged students to campus without such special assistance is indefensible. As one student of these programs nationally has noted, "it appears that most institutions take pride in treating all students just alike, which is tantamount to abdicating their responsibility to these students with special needs."

  This is a matter that needs earnest institutional attention.

- The obligation to establish a systematic and orderly basis for evaluating institutional experience with disadvantaged students and for improving the quality of the program. Among the more obvious aspects of such an evaluation would be:

  - An evaluation of the criteria and procedures for selecting the disadvantaged students to be admitted to the institution.

  - An evaluation of the efficacy of the total environment which is to be offered these students, and consideration as to whether a congenial environment can be provided.

    As one student of these programs said, on the basis of responses from 53 New York colleges and universities having programs for the disadvantaged, the lack of involvement of the larger university community was one of the most serious limitations.

  - An evaluation of the extent, range, and efficacy of the special services provided the disadvantaged youth, particularly the academically disadvantaged.

  - An evaluation of the measures by which the programs for the disadvantaged can be effectively evaluated.

  - An evaluation of the avenues by which financial support may be provided without an unnecessarily severe impact on the maintenance of a total program of student financial aid for the widely varying kinds of students found on our campuses.

  The establishment of the mechanism for providing the kind of evaluation needed will require the investment of substantive financial and manpower resources. But nothing less will permit the sort of institutional stewardship that the development and continuing improvement of these programs will require.

These evaluative reports by the institutions should provide the Board's office with the necessary information in terms of which the Board could be kept informed of the status of these programs and institutional progress with them.

General Characteristics of State System Programs for the Disadvantaged

In this section of the report (pp. 25-38) we shall present in serial fashion a description of the general character of the Upward Bound, High School Equivalency, Three Percent, and BOOST programs.

Upward Bound

Purpose of Upward Bound

The 1968-69 guidelines for Upward Bound programs, issued by the Washington, D.C. Office of Economic Opportunity (OEO), makes the following statement as to the general purpose of the Upward Bound programs:

> Upward Bound is a pre-college preparatory program designed to generate the skills and motivation necessary for success in education beyond the high school among young people from low-income backgrounds and inadequate secondary school preparation. It acts to remedy poor academic preparation and motivation in secondary school and thus increase a youngster's promise for acceptance and success in a college environment.

Projects Funded in 1968-69

Speaking of the 1968-69 Upward Bound programs in the United States, the guidelines said:

> Begun on a national basis in June 1966, UPWARD BOUND programs were supported by OEO for a first year at 215 colleges, universities, and residential secondary schools. These 215 academic institutions in 47 states, the Virgin Islands, Puerto Rico, and Guam, in turn committed themselves to serve 20,000 youngsters, most of whom had completed the tenth and eleventh grades.
>
> By 1968 approximately 300 institutions were participating in the program, in every state in the country, serving some 26,000 students - many of whom were returning after previous enrollment in UPWARD BOUND.

It may be of some interest to note that although the Upward Bound program began nationally in 1966, the University of Oregon, as one of the pioneers in the Upward Bound movement had one of the few such programs funded in the summer of 1965.

1968-69 Status of Upward Bound Programs in the State System of Higher Education

The University of Oregon and Oregon State University were the two state system institutions having Upward Bound programs in 1968-69. The University of Oregon had 67 9th through 12th grade and bridge students; Oregon State University had 71 11th and 12th grade students.

The term "bridge students" refers to those students who have completed high school and who are attempting to "bridge" into the college-level institution. Such "bridging" requires not alone financial assistance to the student, as we shall describe later in this report, but it includes special provisions to meet these students' special health, social, and academic problems in the college and university environment. More is said of this matter later in this report.

Three other four-year institutions in Oregon were reportedly among the approximately 300 colleges and universities in the United States which had Upward Bound programs in 1968-69:

- Pacific University - 53 9th through 12th grade, and bridge students
- Reed College - 45 bridge students
- University of Portland - 60 10th, 11th, 12th grade, and bridge students

The Upward Bound Student

The OEO guidelines for 1968-69 indicated that the criteria for the selection of students for Upward Bound were as follows:

1. Poverty Background. "The UPWARD BOUND student is a young person with academic potential who because of his poverty background has not had the motivation or preparation to use or demonstrate this potential . . . Typically this student may be apathetic or even hostile . . . or he has shunned meaningful educational pursuits because of inadequate school experiences. Quite often the potential that such a student possesses may not show in traditional measurements, such as standardized test scores or grades, but may be revealed more readily through intuitive judgments."

2. Income Criteria. Ninety percent of the students in any given Upward Bound program to be financed by OEO are to be from families whose annual income meets the poverty criteria set forth by OEO. For non-farm families consisting of four members, the criterion income for 1968-69 was $3,200 (raised to $3,300 in 1969-70). For farm families of four persons, the criterion income was $2,200 (raised to $2,300 in 1969-70). Ten percent of the students in 1968-69 could come from families with a slightly higher income ($4,000 for non-farm families; $2,600 for farm families).

However, the OEO income requirement is satisfied if:

- the prospective student lives in federally-supported public housing.
- the student comes from a family having higher than the criterion incomes, but in which there was "serious mismanagement of family income and little if any of such income accrues to the benefit of the student." In this instance, "the applicant or delegate academic institution must obtain written testimony from a reliable third party that serious mismanagement of a family's income does exist and works a significant hardship on the prospective UPWARD BOUND student."

OEO encourages institutions wishing to enroll in the Upward Bound program students whose families' income levels are above the stated criteria to obtain funds from other public or private sources to support the program for those students.

3. Grade Level. OEO desires that the Upward Bound programs focus on students completing the tenth and eleventh grades. In instances in which applicant institutions and agencies can demonstrate that there are severe dropout rates in grades earlier than the tenth and eleventh, OEO will consider proposals involving eighth and ninth grade students.

   OEO stipulates in the guidelines that ". . . once a program begins, institutions must be prepared to work with the UPWARD BOUND students through the secondary school years and to design UPWARD BOUND programs for these students through the summer following the twelfth grade, that is through what we call the Bridge Summer - the summer between high school graduation and college enrollment. OEO feels that, in general, institutions which select only students who have graduated from high school and enroll them for only one summer do not have sufficient time to work with the UPWARD BOUND students. It therefore discourages submission of proposals containing such a component."

4. Recruitment. OEO asks applicant institutions to use a wide variety of recruitment sources, including, but not limited to, the following: individual classroom teachers, guidance officers, school principals, high school students, present and former Upward Bound students, community action agencies, youth opportunity centers, Vista Volunteers, Job Corps centers, neighborhood youth corps, juvenile court officers, settlement houses, and the community organizations.

5. Selection. OEO guidelines state that:

   > Students selected for UPWARD BOUND shall be those who have potential for success in a two or four-year college, but whose present level of achievement and/or motivation would seem to preclude their acceptance in such an institution.
   >
   > Recommendations from persons who know the applicant (such as classroom teachers) and intuitive judgments by these and

> other persons are as important for selection as patterns of grades and test scores . . . While a moderate amount of testing after admission to an UPWARD BOUND project is permissible, testing for admission is discouraged.
>
> It is very important that candidates be personally interviewed by some members of the UPWARD BOUND staff prior to their admission by the program.

General Area of Service

OEO recommends that, since colleges with Upward Bound programs must work closely with the secondary schools from which the students come, they should seek to serve a geographic area close enough to provide convenient working relationships with the secondary schools. In the words of OEO:

> A project should generally serve areas which are not more than 50 miles from the campus at which students will reside for the summer, although exceptions to this principle will be permitted when circumstances so dictate . . . Having a sizeable cluster of students returning to a single school is very important. Both in the summer and in the academic year a cluster of students should gain a common core of experience to share with one another and with their school classmates. Whenever possible, secondary school staff from the schools from which the UPWARD BOUND students are coming should be used in a teaching, tutorial, or counseling capacity during the entire period of the program - summer as well as academic year.

Relationships to Community Action Agencies

OEO expects the sponsoring institution to work closely with OEO-administered Community Action programs. OEO requires that institutions operating Upward Bound programs establish a public advisory committee consisting of people from the institution, from the local Community Action agency, secondary schools, civic leaders, and residents of the "target" neighborhoods from which Upward Bound students come. (These residents must themselves meet the OEO poverty criteria.)

In order to establish an effective involvement of the Upward Bound program with relevant Community Action agencies, OEO requires that before the applicant institutions submit their applications, they secure an appraisal of their proposed program by all approved Community Action agencies in the communities from which the students are to be selected.

Composition of Student Group Selected

It is the desire of OEO that the programs be interracial in character.

Parental Involvement

It is anticipated that institutions operating Upward Bound programs will seek to involve in the program the parents of the students included. Such involvement is to take the form of on-campus visits in the summer by parents to observe Upward Bound activities, membership on the Community Advisory Committee, and visits by project personnel to the homes of the students to discuss the students' educational development or their post-high school educational plans. Institutions are authorized to make OEO budget requests to meet the costs appropriate to such parental involvement.

Commitment of the Academic Institution Required

OEO expects that participating institutions will demonstrate their commitment to the Upward Bound program by such evidence as the following:

1. Formation of an Academic Policy Group. It is expected that a participating institution will establish on its campus an Upward Bound academic policy group, representative of the institutional faculty resources of the various departments and schools of the institution, "including members of the liberal arts faculty and important representation from the administration." Representation from the regular student body on this policy group is considered desirable. OEO expects that this policy group will participate in the planning and the implementation of Upward Bound projects.

2. Physical Facilities. Classrooms, dormitories, informal lounges, recreation rooms and staff offices are to be of the same general quality as those provided for the regular students and staff. OEO discourages special identification on campus of Upward Bound students.

3. Staff. Upward Bound staff are expected to be persons "with demonstrated sensitivity to and respect for the kinds of students to be enrolled in Upward Bound." It is desired that members of the institution's regular teaching staff be involved in the Upward Bound program. The racial composition of the staff who will participate in the program is to be shown in the application to OEO.

4. Guidance in Post-Secondary Education. The participating institution is expected to show the extent of its commitment to Upward Bound students by showing in their application to OEO the kinds of advice on post-secondary education it will provide, "especially in locating finances for higher education for these students."

5. Secondary School-College Relations. Institutions are required by OEO to indicate the nature and extent of cooperation with secondary schools by the inclusion of secondary school personnel in the Upward Bound Advisory Committee, and by development of continuing cooperation and active involvement with secondary school personnel.

6. Assistance for Upward Bound "Graduates." Although OEO funds may not be used to support a follow-up program for students who have entered college, OEO nonetheless encourages the institutions to apply private and

institutional resources in the offering of counseling and tutoring programs for Upward Bound students in college, especially during their freshman year.

7. Residential Programs. OEO prefers programs providing on-campus residence for Upward Bound students, although non-residential programs are also considered for funding.

8. Health. Participating institutions are required by OEO to provide "necessary health services for UPWARD BOUND students, many of whom have not previously had sufficient care, resulting in a negative effect on their attitudes toward and capacity for learning." The costs of these services to the Upward Bound students may be included in the Upward Bound budget.

   Participating institutions are expected to provide or to arrange for diagnostic services "which will produce information on the medical and dental needs of UPWARD BOUND students."

   Project directors are asked by OEO to have on file a medical consent form of a comprehensive character duly signed by the students' parents or guardian, and that it authorize "preventive, corrective, routine, and emergency medical and dental services for the entire period the student is enrolled in UPWARD BOUND."

   "Costs of such treatment should be met," OEO says, "by in-kind professional services at the local level, wherever this is feasible and readily available, and/or from the UPWARD BOUND budgets. Applicants are urged to avail themselves for free state and local medical facilities such as are provided for low-income persons in Title 19 of the 'Medicare Bill.'"

The Upward Bound Program

1. Curriculum. Concerning the Upward Bound curriculum, the 1967-68 OEO guidelines made the following observations:

   > The content of the curriculum is designed by the educational institution. Because Upward Bound is a full-year program, the academic year portion of the program is as important as the more concentrated summer phase. OEO, in reviewing proposals, will give equal attention to the winter program and the on-campus summer program. The curriculum for both phases should be developed to provide the intellectual qualities and the attitudes necessary for success in college. It should aim, therefore, to develop critical thinking, effective expression, and positive attitudes toward learning.
   >
   > Students whose motivation toward learning is already low or non-existent are unlikely to change their attitudes if the curriculum and academic climate are similar to what they have rejected. If they have not been "reached" by lectures, by lack of opportunities to express freely their own ideas, by

an overemphasis on facts, by dull textbooks or work books, or tedious drill, by a repetition of the same material, it is imperative for an Upward Bound program to offer them first-rate material which is at the same time exciting and relevant to them. To do this requires teachers who honestly believe that the subject they teach is important for the student to know and who themselves genuinely enjoy and know their subject matter. Past experience has shown that it is particularly important that to be motivational the classes should be academically challenging. UPWARD BOUND students returning for a second year may need a curriculum different, at least in part, from that offered new students. This may even include access to regular college courses given for credit.

2. Other Educational Goals. Institutions are encouraged by OEO to provide activities "which will enhance the personal effectiveness of the students and provide opportunities for the application of learning experiences to life experiences (i.e., self-government, a student newspaper, student services to others - such as tutoring of younger school pupils or other neighborhood activities).

   Cultural programs, including field trips to important historic, artistic, or cultural places in nearby areas, are required portions of the program, as well as recreational and physical activities.

Staff for Upward Bound

The staff for Upward Bound must, according to OEO, include both college and secondary school faculty. Institutions are admonished to select staff on the basis of "experience with and/or demonstrated sensitivity to and respect for the kinds of students to be enrolled in UPWARD BOUND projects." It is expected that at least one-third of the teaching staff will be members of the applicant institution, and at least one-third should be regular teachers in the secondary schools (preferably from schools from which the Upward Bound students are to come). It is also suggested by OEO that special contributions to the program can by made by Peace Corps returnees, VISTA Volunteers, undergraduate and graduate students, youth workers and the like.

OEO also counsels participating institutions to include in their planning provision for tutor-counselors, namely students from within or without the institution who can, during the period when the Upward Bound students are on campus, live in the dormitories with them. In particular, institutions are counseled to employ as tutor-counselors, students who are eligible for work-study funds under the Higher Education Act of 1965. Upward Bound funds may be used as the grantee's local Work-study share for students working in Upward Bound.

Other supporting staff are drawn from professional and non-professional persons from the community from which the students are selected. When feasible, OEO prefers that "for non-professional positions priority be given to residents of the area from which students come."

The ratio of students to staff is expected to reflect the fact that the Upward Bound program is intended to provide the students with a maximum opportunity for self-expression and for class-student-teacher exchange and discussion. Student-teacher or student-tutor interchange is considered as important in the academic year program as during the summer program on campus.

The High School Equivalency Program

The high school equivalency program (HEP) is a University of Oregon program, which was launched with federal funds July 15, 1967. It is designed to provide assistance to school dropouts among migrants, generally aged 16-22, by preparing them to pass the General Educational Development Test which qualifies them for receipt from the state department of education of a certificate of high school equivalency.

The certificate of equivalency is accepted generally by colleges and universities as a basis for admission in lieu of a high school diploma.

The University of Oregon program is reported to be one of a small number of such programs in the United States and according, to University officials, it is one of the few such programs which aim to provide students a background to sustain them in the pursuit of a college education. More commonly HEP programs point the individual more toward vocational education and/or employment.

The duration of the program varies from student to student but ranges from six weeks to one year. The length of the student's program is dependent upon the time required to prepare him adequately for the General Educational Development Test and, hopefully, to give him needed background to succeed in college. The preparatory courses are in five basic areas: language, literature, social science, physical science, and mathematics.

The staff for the program is paid from federal funds. Students who have participated in and been successful in the Upward Bound or HEP programs are used in the HEP program as aides. If they continue to work in the HEP program for more than a year, they are given increasingly more significant responsibilities in the HEP teaching program until, by the third year of such serveice, some become very skillful in teaching the basic subjects to the disadvantaged, it is reported by the University.

When a HEP student has completed successfully the General Educational Development Test and has received a certificate of equivalency, he is guided toward college or university attendance.

To help the HEP students make the transition into college-level work, they are normally permitted to take a six-hour college course load, augmented by a six-hour HEP program load, the latter intended to be supportive of the college courses the student is taking. The second term of the student's college experience, his college load is generally increased slightly, with a corresponding reduction in the supportive work provided through HEP.

University HEP officials report that there is a large volunteer program operative in support of the HEP and Upward Bound projects. These volunteers, consisting of upper-division and graduate students for the most part, receive no pay, but do receive academic credit therefor. As many as 500 such volunteers have been active in a single year.

The Three Percent Program

At the March 12, 1968 meeting of the board of higher education, the Chancellor reported to the board that he had authorized the institutions to enter upon an experimental program under which they would be authorized, effective with 1968-69, to admit a number of freshmen totaling no more than three percent of the institution's previous year's freshman class as calculated by the board's office, "who have not met the basic admission requirements."

Nonresidents may constitute no more than one-half of the institution's quota under this experimental program. And any nonresident admitted under this provision is held to meet the resident requirement for admission.

The three percent quota is based on the previous year's enrollment of freshmen "fresh out of high school" - that is, freshmen without any previous college experience. Under the three percent limitation, the maximum numbers of students to be admitted under the experimental admissions policy for the fall of 1968 and 1969 is shown below.

Summer session enrollments are not included since there are no specified admission requirements for the summer term.

Students admitted through such programs as Upward Bound need not be counted as a part of the three percent quota above.

Institution	Enrollment of Freshmen New from High School		Quotas of Freshmen to Be Admitted Under Three Percent Policy	
	Fall 1967	Fall 1968	Fall 1968	1969
UO	2,377	2,308	71	69
OSU	3,146	3,303	94	99
PSU	1,774	1,638	53	49
OCE	752	895	23	27
SOC	1,194	1,193	36	36
EOC	438	497	13	15
OTI	439	447	13	13

Participation in the foregoing experimental program is entirely voluntary on the part of the institution.

It is intended that students admitted under this experimental policy shall be integrated into the academic community as completely as possible; that there is nothing in the policy which would require that students thus admitted be identified in the classroom situation.

The BOOST Program

BOOST is an acronym for Bettering Oregon's Opportunity for Saving Talent. The program is being administered by the office of high school relations of the Oregon State System of Higher Education under a grant from the federal government.

Project director since the inception of the program has been Mr. Bob Lutz, himself a one-time migrant worker with a sixth-grade education who, at age 39, sought a college education.. Mr. Lutz now holds a master's degree. The 1968-69 staff consisted of 3.25 FTE, consisting of Mr. Lutz, an assistant director, a full-time urban coordinator, and a rural coordinator at .25 FTE. For 1969-70 the staff will consist of 3.98 FTE.

The BOOST project grew out of a recognition that the program of annual visitations by state system and institutional representatives to the high schools and junior high schools of the state, as organized and administered by the Board's office of high school relations, good as it unquestionably is, was failing to reach many young people who need special counseling, and who need it relatively early in their public school education, if they are to see the advantages of these opportunities soon enough to prepare themselves to take advantage of them. Mr. Richard Pizzo, director of the state system office of high school relations therefore sought special federal funding to finance the establishment of an office whose function it would be to seek out these young people throughout the state, and to work with the high school counselors in helping them to identify the young people needing this special attention. Three annual grants have resulted: 1967-68, $55,000; 1968-69, $70,000; 1969-70, $69,000.

The BOOST office is located in Portland where many of Oregon's disadvantaged live. But the BOOST program reaches out into all areas of the state in recognition of the fact that the disadvantaged youngsters are to be found everywhere, not alone in the heavily populated areas of Portland, or in the migrant camps of our rural areas.

The BOOST staff work with:

- High school principals and high school counselors to help them identify the disadvantaged students who need special counseling help and attention if they are to be encouraged to make the most of the opportunities open to them for post-high school education. Work with the high school counselors has the dual advantage of putting the BOOST office in touch with the disadvantaged students themselves, and of sensitizing the counselors to these students and their needs.

  Workshops are held throughout the state to acquaint counselors and teachers with BOOST's aims, and the BOOST staff visits all high schools once and some twice annually.

  The BOOST staff has also developed: (1) a simple student questionnaire to help counselors identify "hidden talent" young people, and (2) a directory of post-high school educational programs and financial assistance available to needy students in Oregon to assist counselors in advising young people of possible educational opportunities.

- Disadvantaged high school students. The BOOST staff works directly with disadvantaged high school students for the purpose of providing them the special kinds of counseling assistance they need to inform them of the advantages of post-high school educational and related opportunities, and to sensitize them to the fact that post-high school opportunities are not beyond their reach financially or otherwise, if they will but prepare themselves.

  It is the hope of the BOOST program staff that these contacts with disadvantaged students can be extended downward from high school to junior high school and subsequently down as far as the fifth and sixth grades. Mr. Lutz emphasizes the need for working with these young people early in their lives. The most effective counseling can be done when it reaches down into the elementary grades and is continous through junior high school and into high school. If such counseling is limited only to the high school years, and more specifically to the junior and senior years of high school, it comes too late for maximum effect. For many young people who might have benefited from such attention will by then have dropped from school, and many others are reached too late in their careers for the counseling to have much impact on their motivation and achievement.

- Colleges and universities of Oregon. BOOST's aim is: (1) to secure from the public and independent two- and four-year colleges and universities of Oregon commitments to accept the disadvantaged young people identified through BOOST, and to provide them with the financial assistance they will need while enrolled; (2) to sensitize college and university counselors to the special problems and needs of the disadvantaged students who are to be admitted under the BOOST program.

  During the first two years of the BOOST program, institutions were not asked by BOOST to admit students who could not meet the institution's regular admissions requirements. It was felt that among the disadvantaged there was more than a sufficient number who could meet the institutions' admissions standards to fill all of the position vacancies for which the institutions were able to guarantee adequate financial assistance. BOOST officials also felt that most institutions in Oregon were not geared to provide the special kinds of help that the truly high risk young people would require if they are to have a fair chance to succeed. Consequently, all but a very small percentage of the BOOST students are able to meet regular admission requirements.

  BOOST is asking institutions to make commitments not alone to senior students, but to sophomore and junior students as well, contingent upon their completion of high school requirements and there being no significant improvement in their financial status.

- Owners and managers of small and middle-size businesses in Oregon. The BOOST staff recognizes that for some of the disadvantaged students identified, the most useful opportunities may not lie in college and university life, but in meaningful employment related to the individual's abilities and potentialities. Consequently, the staff has developed what promises to be a very significant program in which owners and mangers of small and middle-size businesses in Oregon are asked to provide for the BOOST-identified youngsters opportunities in business. Mr. Lutz reports that these businesses, like the colleges and universities, have been most cooperative and helpful in agreeing to provide disadvantaged youngsters meaningful opportunities in this instance in business.

- Miscellaneous - churches, social agencies, and the like. Boost recruiters also make effective use of selected church groups and various public and private social agencies of the state in their search for qualified young people who can be recommended to the institutions. The Portland Adult Literacy Program (OEO funded), county welfare organizations, Neighborhood Youth Corps, the Portland Council of Churches, migrant labor camps, and various Indian tribes are illustrative of the types of such agencies with which BOOST has been working.

The Future Financing of the BOOST Program

As noted above, the BOOST program has been financed by three federal grants providing support for 1967-68, 1968-69, and 1969-70. We are told that there is very real question whether a federal grant will be forthcoming for 1970-71. It is known that the government is disinclined to continue support beyond the first two or three years, on the assumption that if the program is worthwhile the state will have recognized its worth within that period and will be prepared to undertake its support. Decisions must soon be made by the board as to the state system posture vis-vis the future financial support of BOOST.

Eastern Oregon College
Program for the Disadvantaged

Eastern Oregon College programs for the disadvantaged include: (1) the three percent admissions program, and (2) the BOOST program.

Three Percent Admissions Program

Eastern Oregon College admitted 14 students under the three percent admissions program. Fourteen enrolled fall term, 12 winter, and 10 spring.

- Of the 14, 11 were residents of Oregon.
- Twelve had high school grade point averages below 2.00, the regular admission standard at EOC. Two had grade point averages in the 2.00 - 2.40 range.
- All 14 were Caucasian Americans.
- Twelve got no student financial aid, one received full financial aid, and one partial aid. The total financial aid amounted to $2,400, of which $1,400 came from federal grants and loans ($700 NDEA loan, $1,000 guaranteed loan, and $700 opportunity grant), and $1,000 was in the form of a guaranteed private bank loan.

EOC did not inform the faculty as to the identity of the students admitted under the three percent program, feeling that the students' adjustment to campus life would be easier if they were not set apart in any way from other students. An EOC spokesman suggested that the anonymity of the three percent program students resulted in their getting no more and no less attention from the instructors in their classes than the general run of EOC's students.

The dean of students acted as head counselor for the three percent program students. He provided them with an orientation to the college, and counseled them in the selection of their programs and courses. They were assigned regular academic advisors in the fields of their indicated interest, but the dean of students continued to maintain a general oversight of their activities, counseling with them from time to time, particularly following receipt of mid-term and final grades.

The only special assistance proffered these students was tutorial help in remedial reading, vocabulary building, spelling, and mathematics. A retired faculty member, a specialist in reading, volunteered to tutor the three percent program students. Five accepted the offer of help, but only three participated, and only one of the three continued to receive help over any extended period.

EOC spokesmen in closest contact with the three percent program students observe that the two principal problems faced by the students are: (1) lack of motivation, and (2) deficiencies in basic academic skills.

These problems are not unique to the three percent program students, an EOC spokesman observed. They are common problems to be found among young people. He expressed the view that more extensive tutorial help is needed, for the problems faced by young people with poor academic records tend to be individual problems that are more likely to yield to individual attention.

Academic Progress of Three Percent Program Students

For the three percent program students, EOC moderated its requirements for retention. No minimum credit requirement was established for these students, and the grade point average required for retention was reduced from 2.00, the general institutional requirement, to a 1.50 applied on a yearly basis.

- Of the 14 students, seven completed 3 terms of work in 1968-69. Of these, five, with cumulative credits ranging from 31 to 46 hours, had cumulative grade point averages at or above the 1.50 established for retention in good standing in this program, the range being from 1.50 to 2.40, with only two above the 2.00 GPA level generally required at EOC for retention in good standing.

  The other two of the seven who completed 3 terms, with cumulative credits earned of 26 and 34, had GPA's of 1.05 and 1.20.

- Of the remaining seven students, two withdrew in the fall term and thus had no grade point average, two withdrew in the winter term, having earned 3 and 6 credits respectively in the fall term, with grade point averages of .78 and 1.00, and two withdrew in the spring term, having earned a total of 14 and 5 credits respectively with cumulative GPA's of 1.06 and .45. One student withdrew winter term and enrolled again spring term, earning a total of 19 hours credit with a GPA of 1.94.

Plans for 1969-70

EOC reports that it plans to continue the 3 percent program in 1969-70 and 1970-71, but with emphasis upon recruitment of Indians living on the reservations of eastern Oregon. EOC plans to provide special tutoring and remedial help for them and to make a more vigorous, concerted effort to encourage these students to take full advantage of the tutorial help that is to be made available.

The BOOST Program

EOC has been involved in the BOOST program since the fall of 1967. The few who were recruited in 1967 merged into the student body and no special records were kept of them.

Eleven students were recruited by EOC through the BOOST program for 1968-69. Only one of these withdrew from school during the year. All were residents of Oregon and all were Caucasian Americans.

All of the BOOST students met the regular EOC admission requirement of a 2.00 high school grade point average, as the following distribution shows:

High School GPA	No. of Students
Below 2.00 GPA	-
2.00 - 2.49	1
2.50 - 2.99	7
3.00 - 3.49	2
3.50 - 4.00	1

Of the 11 BOOST students, six received no financial aid, two partial aid, and three full financial aid. The aid granted totaled $5,090, of which $4,400 was from federal sources ($2,200 NDEA loan, $2,200 opportunity grant), and $690 was in the form of a state grant.

BOOST students were indistinguishable from the general run of EOC students and subject to the same conditions.

The one BOOST student who withdrew from school had a 1.47 GPA on 15 hours at the close of the fall term. Of the remaining 10 BOOST students, eight had cumulative GPA's above 2.00 at year's end ranging from a GPA of 2.14 to 3.09. Two had cumulative GPA's below 2.00 (1.22 on a total of 19 earned credits in three terms, and 1.95 on 47 credit hours).

Institutional Plans

EOC plans to continue to be active in the BOOST program in 1969-70 and 1970-71, but intends placing more emphasis on recruitment of qualified Indian students.

Oregon College of Education
Programs for the Disadvantaged

Oregon College of Education participates in: (1) the three percent admissions program, and (2) the BOOST program.

Three Percent Admissions Program

Selection of students to be admitted under the three percent admissions program in 1968-69 was made at Oregon College of Education by a screening committee of four persons.

Nine students were offered admission under the program.

- Seven were Caucasian Americans; two were Black Americans
- All were residents of Oregon.
- Six had cumulative high school grade point averages of from 2.00 to 2.40; three had GPA's below 2.00.

Seven students (five Caucasian American, two Black American) enrolled in the fall of 1968; six remained winter term and four remained spring term.

The rules applicable to the general run of OCE's students with respect to grade point requirements were applied to the students admitted under the three percent program, with full provision for petition by the students for such special conditions as the specific needs of a given student would warrant.

Institutional requirements are that to be eligible for financial aid a student must carry a minimum of 12 credit hours of work per term and be in good standing, which is to say he must have a grade point average of 2.00 or above.

All seven of the students enrolled under this program in the fall term were given financial aid - four full financial aid, and three partial aid. Financial aid totaled $8,400 of which $6,295 was in federal funds ($2,750 NDEA loan, $1,150 work-study, $2,395 opportunity grant), $505 state funds, and $1,600 from a private grant.

Available to these students were the resources (e.g., the study skills center, counseling center, health services center) OCE has developed over the years to serve the needs of those of its students who encounter academic and other difficulties for which remedial help can be offered. Efforts were made by OCE to maintain continuing and close touch with students through mature senior students asked to work with them on an assigned basis, and through faculty.

Academic Progress of Students

Of the seven students enrolled in this program in the fall term 1968, one withdrew in the fall term, two were suspended at the end of winter term for academic deficiencies, and one at the end of the spring term. Three students remained at the end of the year, two with grade points above 2.00 (2.03 and 2.47) and one on probation (with a cumulative grade point average of 1.87).

Difficulties most often encountered by students in the program, as identified by some who have worked most closely with the programs are lack of motivation in some instances, and a lack of basic academic skills.

Institutional Plans

OCE proposed to continue the three percent admissions programs in 1969-70 and 1970-71. Effort will be made to select for admission to this program students from a variety of localities and groups, thus to diversify the student body. The college desires such diversification as a means of enriching the experiences of its students. It hopes, too, to work more closely with students in this program in terms of their individual abilities, perceptions, and attitudes.

The BOOST Program

OCE's BOOST program began in 1967-68, but this report relates only to the 1968-69 program.

Fifty-seven students were enrolled in OCE under the BOOST program in 1968-69.

- All were residents of Oregon.
- All were high school graduates except one who held a GED certificate of equivalency.
- The majority of BOOST students enrolled had high school grade point averages that met OCE's admission standards (2.25 fall term; 2.00 winter and spring term), as the following tabulation makes clear:

Below 2.00 GPA	3
2.00 - 2.24	3
2.25 - 2.49	12
2.50 - 2.99	20
3.00 and above	18
Not reported	1
Total	57

- The majority of the students admitted were Caucasian American as shown below:

Caucasian Americans	45
Black Americans	8
Mexican Americans	3
American Indians	1
Total	57

- Thirteen were given full financial aid; 44 partial aid. Total aid amounted to $59,568 of which $49,018 was in the form of federal grants and loans ($18,700 NDEA loans, $12,418 work-study, $16,900 opportunity grants), $3,456 from state funds, $7,094 from foundation grants, and $1,000 in guaranteed loans.

Institutional resources available to BOOST students in the remediation of their problems were the same as those available to all OCE students. Among the best known and most frequently used are: the study skills center, the counseling center, health services center, and the like.

Academic Progress of BOOST Students

Fifty-seven students identified through BOOST resources were enrolled at OCE in 1968-69. Five of these students were admitted under the three percent admissions program and hence have been included in the figures for that program, leaving but 52 BOOST students to be considered in this present discussion.

Of these 52 students, three withdrew while in good academic standing. Eight withdrew while not in good academic standing (GPA's less than 2.00). Of the remaining 41 students, 32 (78.0 percent) were in good academic standing at the close of the year (that is, their cumulative GPA's were 2.00 or above).

Institutional Plans

OCE plans to continue the BOOST program in 1969-70 and 1970-71. They feel that the program has been a useful one, of benefit both to the college and to the students. They, like other institutions in the state system, have felt the financial pinch in endeavoring to do all that the college would like to do by way of increasing the numbers involved and providing more adequately for those in the program.

Oregon Technical Institute
Programs for the Disadvantaged

Oregon Technical Institute's chief efforts at working with the disadvantaged students are funneled through its BOOST program.

The BOOST Program

OTI launched a BOOST program in the fall of 1968. Forty-two students applied for and were offered admission under this program. Of these, 29 enrolled.

- Twenty-six (89.7 percent) of the 29 were residents of Oregon.
- Twenty-eight were Caucasian American, one a Mexican American.
- All 29 met the regular admissions standards of OTI, 28 by high school graduation as shown below and one by SAT score.

Below 2.00	0
2.00 - 2.49	8
2.50 - 2.99	11
3.00 or above	9
Total	28

- Thirteen students received full financial aid ($1,800), 16 students received partial aid. Aid per term averaged $531 ($1,593 per annum) with a range per term of $300-600 ($1,400 to $1,800 per annum). Total amount of aid received by the students was $46,225, all from federal NDEA, work-study, and educational opportunity grant funds.

No special services not available to other OTI students were offered the BOOST students, apart from the financial aid they received.

Academic Progress of Students

Of the 29 students enrolled fall term under the BOOST program, two withdrew for academic reasons, five withdrew while in good academic standing. Of the remaining 22, all but one (cumulative grade point average 1.98) had cumulative GPA's in excess of 2.00 (ranging from 2.08 to 3.74). Five of the 22 students (22.7 percent) had cumulative GPA's above 3.00 (ranging from 3.02 to 3.74).

Institutional Plans

OTI expresses its intention of continuing to cooperate in the BOOST program in 1969-70 and 1970-71. Their experience with these students has been good.

Oregon State University
Programs for the Disadvantaged

Oregon State University's programs for the disadvantaged are: (1) Upward Bound program, (2) three percent admissions program, and (3) BOOST program.

Upward Bound Program

OSU has had an Upward Bound program since the summer of 1966. It enrolled 80 students in the summer of 1966, and 90 in each of the summers 1967 and 1968.

The first summer (1966) the bulk of the students (93.8 percent) were high school juniors. In 1967 and 1968, high school seniors and high school graduates constituted significant portions of the total enrollment, as shown below:

	1966	1967	1968
High school juniors	75	54	42
High school seniors	5	21	27
High school graduates	0	15	21
Total	80	90	90

Ethnic Background

Caucasian Americans constituted the largest ethnic group (78.8, 72.2, 71.1 percent of total) followed by the Black Americans, Mexican Americans, and Indian Americans as shown below:

	1966	1967	1968
Caucasian American	63	65	64
Black American	11	15	14
Mexican American	5	6	6
American Indian	1	4	6
Total	80	90	90

Number of High School Students in Upward Bound Programs During School Year

An important aspect of the Upward Bound program is the follow-up during the school year of those participants in the summer Upward Bound program who return to high school. The aim of this follow-up is to provide motivation to the student in his home surroundings. This is accomplished through visits by members of the Upward Bound staff with the students and their high school counselors during the school year, and by providing the students with some minor financial assistance. In the school years 1966-67, 1967-68, and 1968-69, there were enrolled in these school year programs through OSU 68, 74, and 71 students respectively.

Financing the Upward Bound Programs

The great preponderance of the financial support for the Upward Bound programs at OSU is from the federal government as is revealed by the figures below:

	Summer 1966	1966-67	Summer 1967	1967-68	Summer 1968	1968-69
Federal Grants	$50,624	$25,613	$68,319	$34,020	$64,102	$37,471
Foundation Grants	-	-	-	-	-	-
State System	5,624	2,845	7,591	3,780	16,025	8,900
Total	$56,248	$28,458	$75,910	$37,800	$80,127	$46,371

Number Upward Bound Students Entering Post-High School Programs

Of the students enrolled in the Upward Bound summer programs, eight were known to have gone on in 1967-68, and 14 in 1968-69, as shown below:

	Number Upward Bound Students	
	1967-68	1968-69
Oregon State University	2	6
Oregon College of Education	5	3
University of Oregon	-	2
Pacific University	1	1
Lane Community College	-	2
Total	8	14

It will be noted that of the 22 who were known by OSU to have gone on into post-high school institutions in 1967-68 and 1968-69, eight went to Oregon State University, eight to Oregon College of Education, with one or two each to the University of Oregon, Pacific University, and Lane Community College.

Basis of Admission of Upward Bound Students to Oregon State University

All of the eight Upward Bound students admitted to OSU met OSU's regular admission requirements.

The two Upward Bound students admitted in 1967-68 each had high school grade point averages (2.96, 3.00) sufficiently high to qualify them for admission under OSU's regular admission requirements.

Of the six Upward Bound students admitted to OSU in 1968-69, all but one had either a high school grade point average or a Scholastic Aptitude test score sufficiently high enough to qualify for regular admission. Three of the six were not admissible by high school grade point average, but of these, two had Scholastic Aptitude scores above 887, which is the required minimum SAT test score required for admission.

Student Financial Aid for Upward Bound Graduates Enrolled in Oregon State University

The two Upward Bound graduates enrolled in OSU in 1967-68 were given financial aid in the amounts of $1,430 and $1,700, making a total of $3,130.

The eight Upward Bound graduates enrolled in 1968-69 (two from 1967-68 and six additional for 1968-69) received an average of $1,633 per year in student financial aid, with the range being from $1,234 to $2,000 per year.

The form in which the foregoing aid was granted is as follows:

	1967-68	1968-69
NDEA Loans	$1,000	$4,645
United Student Aid Fund Loan or Guaranteed Loan	450	1,250
Work Study	180	1,390
Educational Opportunity Grants	1,050	4,534
Albina Fund	450	400
Georgia Pacific Scholarship	-	750
Miss Lincoln City Grant	-	100
Total	$3,130	$13,069

Academic Achievement of Upward Bound Graduates at Oregon State University

The achievement of the eight Upward Bound graduates at OSU is shown in the figures below:

Number of Terms Completed By End of 1968-69	Number of Students	Number Hours Earned Toward Degree	Grade Point Average
6	2	74	2.15
		54	1.88
3	6	48	3.37
		47	1.70
		43	1.63
		34	3.12
		25	.25
		22	2.09

Under OSU regulations, to be a full-time student one must carry 12 credit hours per term and achieve an average grade point average of 2.00. It is possible for a student to achieve less than a 2.00 GPA in any given quarter and to be granted probationary status, but to remain in school, he is expected to have achieved a grade point average of 2.00 by the end of the third term.

Special Services Provided Upward Bound Students by OSU

The Upward Bound program at OSU is structured so that during the three years the student is in the program he has the opportunity to get the skills to make it in college: reading skills, study skills, remedial math, and remedial English. All Upward Bound courses include substantial work in the fundamental structure of the subject, for example, in social studies considerable attention is paid to basic concepts of history and geography, concepts with which the regular college student is assumed to be familiar.

No special services are provided graduated Upward Bound students who enter OSU except, in the words of the program director, "a helping hand and an open door to any problems which they may have." This service is optional.

Three Percent Admissions Program

The Three Percent Admissions program was adopted by OSU by action of the faculty senate in April, 1968. It was adopted as an experimental program with the understanding that it would be reviewed at the end of the first year by the faculty and continued with or without modification or discontinued.

Twenty-seven students were offered admission under the program for 1968-69. Of these, 22 matriculated.

Ethnic Background and Resident Status

Seventeen of the 22 students admitted - more than three-fourths (77.4 percent) were Caucasian American, two (9.1 percent) were American Indian, and one each was Black American, Mexican American, and Korean American.

Just over half (54.5 percent) of the students admitted were residents of Oregon.

Academic Status at Time of Admission

Twenty-one of the 22 students enrolled were high school graduates; one had no high school diploma but had completed the General Educational Development test.

The high school grade point average of the students enrolled was as follows:

High School GPA	Number
Below 2.00	3
2.00 - 2.24	8
2.25 - 2.49	2
2.50 - 2.74	8
2.75 - 2.99	-
3.00 or above	-
Total	21

Eleven of the 21 students (52.4 percent) had high school grade point averages below that required of resident students for admission the fall term.

Progress of the Three Percent Students at OSU

Twenty-one students were enrolled fall term under the three percent program. Twenty were enrolled winter term, and fourteen were enrolled spring term. The academic attainments of these students are shown in TABLE I, p. 52.

TABLE I

CREDITS EARNED AND GRADE POINT AVERAGES ACHIEVED
BY STUDENTS ADMITTED UNDER THREE PERCENT PROGRAM, 1968-69

Terms Completed 1	Number of Students 2	Credits Earned Toward Graduation 3	Cumulative Grade Point Average 4
3	13	29	1.65
		34	1.85
		37	2.15
		39	1.66, 2.16, 1.35
		42	2.31, 2.00
		43	1.95, 1.72, 2.44
		45	2.22
		46	3.28
2	6	11	1.43
		13	1.23, .94
		19	1.22
		21	2.05
		23	1.11
1	2	12	1.08, 2.25
0	1	--	--

Just over one-half (59.0 percent) of the 22 students completed a full three terms at OSU in 1968-69. Six completed two terms, two one term, and one student withdrew without completing a term.

Nine students (40.0 percent) had cumulative grade point averages of 2.00 or above, the scholastic standard applicable to regular students for retention. However, given the special problems of some of the students admitted under the three percent policy, there is a disposition on the part of the OSU academic deficiencies committee to give these students extra consideration, particularly where there appears to be evidence that the student may, with more time, acclimate himself to the academic community sufficiently well to succeed at the level required by the University.

Special Assistance Given Students Admitted Under Three Percent Admissions Program

According to the OSU director of special services, students admitted under the three percent admissions program did not wish to be identified to their instructors, dormitory counselors, and others as being a part of the three percent program. This desire was respected by OSU officials. However, OSU did attempt to provide them with special assistance not accorded regular students to the same degree.

This assistance is reported to have included such matters as:

- an orientation conference or conferences upon arrival at OSU and during the early part of the year
- counseling concerning University life, scholastic requirements, assistance available from the institution
- program planning help to guide students in the selection of their courses and programs
- assistance in registration
- tutoring assistance provided by volunteers in some instances, in others, by paid tutors
- special help from the director of special services with the problems that cropped up in the course of the year

The coordinator of special services reported that a meeting held weekly in the evening for these students was helpful in offering them opportunity to share with each other common problems and alternative solutions. The coordinator emphasized the cultural problems that arise when some students, not accustomed to the mores and traditions of the society that has traditionally been associated with college and university life, find themselves faced with the necessity of adjusting to the expectations of this new society. He reported that efforts to help students overcome this hurdle must be continuing.

Financial Aid

The operating cost of the three percent admissions program at OSU was reported to be $12,447 in 1968-69, exclusive of contributed efforts.

	Direct Budget	Percent
Professional Salaries	$ 9,081.67	73
Clerical Expenses	843.63	6
Materials, Expense, Travel	900.00	8
Equipment	299.76	3
Tutors	1,322.28	10
Total	$12,447.34	100

Ten students (45.4 percent) received financial aid. Four received full financial aid, six partial financial aid. Total aid given amounted to $10,925, which was given in the following forms:

	Amount	Percent
NDEA Loans	$1,930	17.7
United Student Aid Fund	2,650	24.2
Work-Study	3,150	28.8
State Rehabilitation Scholarship Grant	738	6.8
OSU Grant-in-Aid	2,457	22.5
Total	$10,925	100.0

The source of these funds is as follows:

	Amount	Percent
Federal Grants	$5,080	46.5
Foundation Grants	-	-
State System (State Rehabilitation Grant)	738	6.8
United Student Aid Fund	2,650	24.2
OSU Athletic Grant-in-Aid	2,457	22.5
Total	$10,925	100.0

Institutional Plans

OSU feels that its experience with the three percent admissions program has been a salutary one. They are aware of the problems involved in recruitment under the three percent program and of the challenges presented by the need to provide these students with special assistance if they are to make effective use of the academic resources of the University. And they wish to continue their efforts to gain skill and effectiveness in both of these aspects involved in serving the interests of the disadvantaged students. The OSU faculty senate, after review of OSU experience during 1968-69, voted in July 1969 to continue the program.

BOOST Program

Oregon State University's BOOST program began in 1968. OSU reports that 174 students applied for admission through BOOST, of whom 127 (72.9 percent) were not offered admission, 11 (6.3 percent) were offered admission but did not enroll, 36 (20.7 percent) were offered admission and enrolled.

Ethnic Background

Thirty-one of the 36 BOOST students enrolled (86.1 percent) were Caucasian American, three (8.3 percent) were Mexican Americans, one was a Black American and one a Japanese American.

Resident and Educational Status

All 36 students who enrolled through the BOOST program in the fall term 1968 were residents of Oregon. All were high school graduates.

All of the BOOST students were admissible to OSU under OSU's regular admission requirements. All but three of the 36 had high school grade point averages of 2.25 or above (the OSU requirement for admission fall term), and these three qualified for admission on the basis of their Scholastic Aptitude Test scores (887 or higher).

Attrition

Of the 36 who enrolled at the beginning of fall term 1968, one withdrew during the term for nonacademic reasons, three withdrew winter term (two for academic deficiencies, one for nonacademic reasons), and seven withdrew spring term (five for academic deficiencies, two for nonacademic reasons).

Academic Achievement

The credits earned and the grade point averages achieved by BOOST students in 1968-69 are reported in TABLE II, p. 56.

It is apparent that the range of credit hours earned per term by the bulk of the BOOST students fall within the normal range. For instance, of the 27 who had completed three terms, fifteen had completed an average of 15 or more credit hours per term, and 9 of the 27 had completed an average of 12 credit hours per term, which is generally considered a minimum load for a full-time student.

As to the cumulative grade point average:

- Of the 27 who had completed three terms, nine (33.3 percent) had cumulative grade point averages below 2.00.
- Of the five who had completed two terms, four had grade point averages below 2.00.

TABLE II

GRADE POINT AVERAGES AND CREDITS EARNED BY STUDENTS ENROLLED IN OSU BOOST PROGRAM, 1968-69

Number of Terms Completed 1	Number of Students 2	Credits Earned in Regular Courses 3	Cumulative Grade Point Averages 4
3	27	22	1.17
		31	1.85
		35	1.41
		36	2.06
		39	1.56, 2.09
		41	1.61, 1.96
		42	1.61, 2.05
		44	1.80, 3.08
		46	1.74, 2.37, 2.67, 2.70, 3.41
		47	2.09, 2.36
		48	3.60
		49	3.16
		50	2.42, 2.62, 3.06, 3.50
		51	2.84, 3.02
2	5	9	1.17
		24	1.30
		25	1.32
		29	2.28
		32	1.87
1	4	3	.38
		10	.50
		12	2.47
		14	2.00

- Two of the four who had completed a single term had cumulative grade point averages below 2.00.

Special Services Provided BOOST Students

OSU provides no special services for BOOST students, other than the financial aid it grants them, that it does not offer to other students. The BOOST students admitted were all admissible under OSU's regular admission requirements. There appeared to be no reason, therefore, why BOOST students should be offered special help by the institution, except for the financial aid granted them.

Student Financial Aid

Twenty-nine of the 36 students received partial aid while enrolled, the amounts received ranging from $600 to $1,500 per annum, or from $200 to $500 per term.

The remaining seven students received full financial aid at approximately $1,600 per annum.

Of the total student financial aid granted BOOST students ($45,525), 95.5 percent was made available by the federal government. The state provided roughly 2.3 percent, and foundation and private grants another 2.2 percent.

Just over half the aid granted (51.4 percent) was in the form of NDEA loans as the following recapitulation shows:

	Amount	%
NDEA Loans	$23,420	51.4
Guaranteed Loans	-	-
United Student Aid Fund	540	1.2
Work Study	2,300	5.1
Educational Opportunity Grant	17,195	37.8
Institutional Grant or Scholarship	2,070	4.5
Total	$45,525	100.0

Institutional Plans

Oregon State University wishes to continue to participate in the BOOST program.

Portland State University
Programs for the Disadvantaged

Portland State University's programs for the disadvantaged are: (1) the three percent admissions program (given the code name "Project Teach"), and (2) the BOOST program.

Project Teach

Forty-six students were admitted to Portland State University through Project Teach in 1968-69, the first year of its operations.

- Forty-three of the 46 (94.0 percent) were residents of Oregon.
- Twenty-two were high school graduates (48.0 percent), 16 were high school dropouts with neither a high school diploma nor a GED certificate of equivalency, four held GED certificates of equivalency and four were college transfers.
- Nineteen of the 22 high school graduates (86.4 percent) had high grade point averages below 2.25, as shown below:

	No.	%
Below 2.00	18	81.9
2.00 - 2.24	1	4.5
2.25 - 2.49	1	4.5
2.50 - 2.74	2	9.1
2.75 and above	0	-
Total	22	100.0

- The largest ethnic group included among the 46 students was the Black American group (54.3 percent), followed in turn by Caucasian American (32.6 percent), Mexican American (8.7 percent), and American Indian (4.4 percent), as shown below:

	No.	%
Black Americans	25	54.3
Caucasian Americans	15	32.6
Mexican Americans	4	8.7
American Indians	2	4.4
Total	46	100.0

- Forty of the 46 students (87.0 percent) were given financial aid. Thirty-five were given full financial aid ($500 per term for unmarried students, $1,100 per term for married students) and five partial aid $200-$400 per term). The total amount of student financial aid provided these students in 1968-69 was $77,967, which was made up of $67,970 in federal grants and loans ($19,150 NDEA loans, $28,420 work-study, $20,400 opportunity grants), $2,500 from the Bureau of Indian Affairs, $3,549 in guaranteed loans, $2,250 from the state rehabilitation scholarship funds, $1,698 in short-term student loans.

In sum, of the $77,967 in student financial aid, $53,570 (69.0 percent) was in the form of grants, work-study funds, and the like, and $24,397 (31.0 percent) was in student loans of one form or another.

Special Assistance to Students

Considerable planning and investment of time has been given by Portland State University in providing assistance to the students enrolled through Project Teach.

- Student Advising. A corps of 12 upperclassmen was hired under the college work-study program to work with these students on a ratio of one advisor to three students. PSU sought to select advisors from the same socio-economic and racial backgrounds as the students with which they would be assigned to work.

  Some difficulty was experienced in achieving this goal because of the fact that it became necessary to make selection from upperclassmen attending PSU in the summer term, and before the Project Teach students had been selected.

  When the students were finally accepted, some difficulty was encountered in matching advisors to students because of differences in academic majors, race, and sex. A number of males, for instance, did not wish to have a female advisor of any race. Commitments to the advisors and budget limitations made it both unwise to terminate the appointment of some of the advisors and not possible to hire new ones.

  The upperclassmen advisors have the following responsibilities:

  1. To seek out and maintain contact with assigned advisees and, if possible, establish meetings on a continuing, regularly scheduled basis.

  2. To inform Project Teach staff of anything out of the ordinary relating to their advisees which seems to require staff attention.

  3. To attempt to contact the teachers of their advisees for the purpose of establishing, explaining, and developing, on an individual basis, possible classroom alternatives, if needed, and to notify Project Teach staff of these faculty contacts.

  4. To notify Project Teach staff regarding nonacademic problems bearing upon academic achievement, such as family, physical problems, personal or emotional problems, outside social pressures.

- Faculty Support. Authorization for this program specifically excluded credit for any remedial or sub-college level work. Admission standards were waived but not exit standards. Hence, faculty must be chosen and class schedules developed for each student on an individual basis. In addition, all of the flexibility of the university - special seminars, reading and conference courses, etc. - not available generally to undergraduates until their junior or senior years, were required for students in this program from the outset. It goes without saying that faculty were selected on the basis of their known interest in student welfare as well as academic competence.

- Orientation. A course entitled "The Individual, The College and Society," (numbered 50, 51, 52) was given emergency approval by the board's office and taught by a member of Project Teach, on a two-credit, three-term, pass-no-pass basis. This was the primary supportive part of the program to help students adjust to a cultural environment substantially different from one to which they were accustomed. The primary goal of the course as described by PSU was "to create a sense of openness and responsiveness to the growth we wished to develop through exposure to new academic and social horizons. The mechanism of the course was adapted to this goal by providing for the division of the class into smaller groups, each meeting one day a week for the prescribed time, during which time the students, the upperclass tutor advisors, the staff (as teachers), the visiting resource persons, could deal with topics and problems brought up in both a spontaneous and a guided manner from the students."

- Reading and Study Skills. A special reading and study skills program was developed during fall term (1968) for Project Teach students. Participation was voluntary. Most students declined to take the program during fall term and only when fall term grades were issued did a group agree to sign up for the two special reading and study skill sessions. PSU reports that, in general, the experience with the reading and study skills program was disappointing, largely because of inexperience with students of the type enrolled in Project Teach.

- Housing. Because some of the students were from outside the metropolitan area, and because some of those from within the area lived under conditions denying them the necessary privacy and quiet for studying, efforts were made to provide student housing at low cost for a part of the students in Project Teach. Initially a house was obtained from the Portland Development Commission and operated on a cooperative basis under the general supervision of a married couple, both of whom were students. This arrangement proved unsatisfactory and subsequently a small apartment house was obtained for project use. This arrangement was better, although not without its problems, too. PSU hopes to continue this kind of housing for these students, although a larger facility will be required.

One of the recurring concerns of institutions working with young people from disadvantaged backgrounds is how to remove them from the kind of environment to which so many of them owe their deprivation, so that they can be given a chance to succeed. They may be admitted to programs such as are being made available under the three percent admissions program, and yet fail because of the weight of the old environment which overweighs anything that can be done for them in the institutional program. Hence, the anxiety of the institutions to see the total environment for these young people changed by providing housing for them and removing them from their home environments.

- Health Services. Deprivation, a circumstance common to most of the students in Project Teach, results in many of the students' medical needs having gone unmet for far too long. Medical needs of a remedial and recurring nature are more likely to beset these students than the normal population. The standard medical insurance plan available to students at PSU does not provide for circumstances which might require extensive dental work, acquisition or replacement of eyeglasses, hearing aids, etc.

  Efforts to go through the University of Oregon Medical School or to use personal contacts of faculty and faculty friends to get needed medical work done for little or no charge, no matter how well intended, continues to carry with it the onus of charity.

  How to provide adequately for the serious health care needs of young people who are the victims of long-term deprivation is a problem to all of the state system institutions.

Academic Progress of Students

PSU has formulated no precise rules for retention of Project Teach students, although the general guidelines which Portland State University followed throughout 1968-69 included the following:

- The student will generally be required to complete 30 graded hours by the end of the fourth term.
- The same tolerance limits in terms of GPA will be applied to these students as to regular students. At present, the minimum required GPA for 30 credit hours is 1.60

Withdrawals

Fall term four students withdrew for nonacademic reasons, none for academic reasons. Winter term three withdrew for academic reasons, none for nonacademic reasons. Spring term six students withdrew - three for academic deficiencies, three for nonacademic deficiencies. There remained at the close of the spring term, 33 students in the program. Of these 33 students, 21 had cumulative grade point averages above the 1.60 figure referred to above as being the minimum standard at PSU for this program. Thirteen had grade point averages 2.00 or above. The general profile of grades is shown on the next page.

TABLE III

CREDITS EARNED AND CUMULATIVE GRADE POINT AVERAGES AT PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY BY PROJECT TEACH STUDENTS

Terms Completed at University	Number of Students	Total Earned Degree Credit	Cumulative Grade Point Average
1	2	3	4
5	1	18	2.16
4	2	12	.33
		32	2.11
3	27	4	.46
		5	.81
		7	.62
		12	1.40, 1.60, 2.00
		14	.96, 1.14
		16	1.63, 1.75
		17	1.75
		19	1.63
		20	1.23, 2.20
		21	1.28, 1.95
		23	1.70, 2.34
		25	2.54, 2.92
		27	2.03, 2.55
		31	1.77
		32	2.21
		33	2.58
		35	2.48
		41	2.19
2	5	0	0
		4	.11
		5	.91
		11	1.36
		14	1.64
1	5	0	0, 0, 0
		3	2.00
		7	1.14
0	6	-	-

Institutional Plans

Portland State University plans to continue Project Teach in 1969-70 and 1970-71. There is strong support for its continuation - a support described as an "overwhelming consensus of the faculty and administration who have worked with the program." PSU considers the record of the first year's experience a good one. And the first year's experience has given insight into the workings of the program which will permit change and improvement in the second and succeeding years. Apart from the demonstrable benefits to the students enrolled in the program, it is the consensus of those most closely associated with PSU that the existence of Project Teach has significantly reduced the level of tension and unrest in the university.

Improvement and progress are to be the keynote of the second year's Project Teach, with the following changes anticipated by the PSU staff.

- Recruitment. We believe that the sources of referral are satisfactory. However, we believe that more care must be exercised in the screening process. We hope to involve in the screening process persons with more professional competence in interviewing and counseling. The process of selection involves judgments about capacity and motivation as well as the ability to assess the total personal situation of prospective persons. This latter point is of particular importance. We have found that a number of students with academic capacity and motivation were unsuccessful because of a complex set of personal problems that were not detected at the time of selection.

- Counseling, tutoring, remedial programs. We expect to make extensive changes in these aspects of the program. We expect to retain the distinction between personal counseling and professional counseling, but to improve the quality of the staff for the former. We expect to use persons with more experience in dealing with students from disadvantaged backgrounds. Moreover we plan to separate formal counseling from tutoring. The latter will be done by the academic departments for the program. Finally we intend to make more use of the expertise in the school of education in developing remedial work in reading and study skills. We are also exploring the possibilities of a cooperative arrangement between our program and the adult literacy program in Portland.

- Programs offered students enrolled. No changes are contemplated at present. Students will do the bulk of their work in regular courses with regular students.

- Waiver of load limit. The load limit should be reduced to 8-10 hours. This will be done if financial aid restrictions permit.

- Financial support. Two important changes are contemplated in our program. First, the work-study component of the financial aid package will be drastically reduced. The difficulties involved in the work-study program for these students were great. It was impossible in many cases to find work-study employment which reenforced the academic program. For the most part it was merely competitive with the academic program for the student's time. Second, the method of payment of financial aid funds will be changed in such a way as to minimize the student's problems of managing his finances. This involves, primarily, smaller and more frequent payments. The overall financial aid amount will be increased from $1,800 to $2,000.

- Social Support. No changes are contemplated.

- Institutional Support. In addition to the more extensive use of the expertise in the area of student personal services, the school of education, and the tutorial facilities of the individual academic departments alluded to above, the University hopes to provide improved housing for a larger number of students in the three percent program.

Project BOOST

Portland State University enrolled its first group of students through Project BOOST in 1967-68, but this present report relates only to those enrolled in 1968-69.

In 1968-69, 31 students were enrolled in PSU through Project BOOST. All were high school graduates and all met PSU's regular admissions standards:

TABLE IV

HIGH SCHOOL GPA'S AND SAT SCORES OF PSU BOOST STUDENTS, 1968-69

High School GPA's	Scholastic Aptitude Scores			Total	
	Below 880	880-886	887 and above	No.	%
1	2	3	4	5	6
Below 2.25	-	-	-	0	0
2.25 - 2.49	-	-	2	2	6.4
2.50 - 2.74	3	-	3	6	19.4
2.75 - 2.99	-	-	6	6	19.4
3.00 and above	4	-	13	17	54.8
Total	7	0	24	31	100.0

All 31 students were residents of Oregon. Twenty-seven (87.1 percent) were Caucasian Americans, three (9.7 percent) were Black Americans, one (3.2 percent) was an Oriental American.

Financial Aid

All 31 students received financial aid in amounts ranging from $300 to $2,832 per annum. Aid granted totalled $30,199.04, $26,578.04 (88.0 percent) from federal funds ($7,954 NDEA, $7,299.04 work-study, $11,325 Educational Opportunity grants), and $3,168 (10.5 percent) from state scholarship funds, and $453 (1.5 percent) in a guaranteed loan.

Academic Progress

Only two BOOST students withdrew from PSU during 1968-69, both for nonacademic reasons. Of the 29 completing three terms of work, two (6.9 percent), with 24 and 30 hours of credit respectively, earned GPA's below 1.60. Six (20.7 percent), with hours of credit earned ranging from 23 to 39, earned GPA's between 1.61 and 1.99. The remaining 21 students (72.4 percent) completed 28-52 hours of credit with grade point averages above 2.00. Median hours earned was 40. Four of the students earned cumulative grade point averages above 3.00, six between 2.50 and 2.99.

Institutional Plans

PSU experience with BOOST has been good and there is every desire to continue to use BOOST resources in identifying students for admission in 1969-70 and 1970-71.

Southern Oregon College
Programs for the Disadvantaged

Southern Oregon College is a participant in two programs designed to serve the needs of the disadvantaged: (1) the three percent admissions program, and (2) the BOOST program.

Three Percent Admissions Program

Southern Oregon College admitted 19 students in 1968-69 under the provisions of the three percent admissions policy. These students had these characteristics:

- Twelve were residents of Oregon; seven nonresidents.
- Sixteen were classified by SOC as Caucasian American; three were Black Americans (all nonresidents).
- Thirteen of the 19 had a grade point average of less than 2.00 on all high school work completed at the time of admission, placing them at a level which would have foreclosed their admission to SOC, were it not for the three percent program. Five students had high school grade point averages from 2.00 to 2.49. One student's grades were unreported.
- According to the SOC financial aid director, these students were, in terms of the socio-economic backgrounds from which they came, generally indistinguishable from the general run of SOC's students. He estimated that their family incomes ranged from $4,800 to $7,800.

Southern Oregon's policy vis-a-vis these students is that inasmuch as this is an experimental program, students remain in good standing the first two terms on the basis of a 1.00 grade point average, but to remain in good standing following the third term, they must have achieved a grade point average of 1.75.

Of the 17 students enrolled in the program, eight completed three terms of work, five two terms, and four one term.

Of the eight who completed three terms, six (with cumulative credits earned ranging from 23 to 46) had grade point averages above the 1.75 required to remain in good standing, ranging from 1.76 to 2.28. Of the five two-term students, two (with 11 and 12 cumulative earned credits) had cumulative grade point averages above the 1.00 required for good standing, and of the four with one term completed, two (with 13 and 15 earned credits) had grade point averages above the 1.00 required for retention in good standing (2.23 and 2.33, respectively).

In short, at the conclusion of the first year of the three percent program at SOC, 10 of the 17 students enrolled remained in good academic standing under the moderated standards defining 1.00 grade point average at the conclusion of either the first or second term as adequate to good standing and a grade point average of 1.75 at the end of the third term as necessary to good standing. If considered in the terms of the 2.00 standard generally applicable to students at SOC, five of the 17 students admitted under the three percent program would have been in good standing at the close of 1968-69 (with cumulative grade point averages ranging from 2.23 to 2.33).

SOC's Services to Students Admitted Under Three Percent Admissions Policy

SOC reports that the registrar and director of admissions had primary responsibility for working with the 17 students enrolled under the three percent admissions policy. Director of admissions counseled with them and sought through close personal contact to see that SOC's available resources were known to the students and that those special resources such as tutoring services were available to the extent possible. Free tutoring service was available for those students desiring it and three special study sessions were held in the residence halls with faculty members discussing with students their problems, including, in particular, academic problems.

Student Financial Aid

Of the 19 students, six (three white, three black) received partial financial aid. None received full financial aid, calculated by SOC to be $1,800.

The average amount of financial aid received was $274 per term, with the amounts ranging from a low of $100 to a high of $400 per term. The aggregate amount granted to these six students during 1968-69 was $4,930. Of this amount, $1,800 (37 percent) was in loans ($800 NDEA, $1,000 guaranteed), $1,980 (40 percent) in work-study funds, and $1,150 (23 percent) in opportunity grant funds.

The grant funds were expended as follows: $2,100 tuition, $900 books and supplies, $1,690 board and room, $120 health needs, $120 pocket money.

Problems Encountered

Officials at SOC indicate that lack of motivation and low-level of competence in the basic skills are the two major problems faced by students admitted under the three percent admissions program. Often lacking effective reading skills, they are reported to find some of the regular college classes, with their heavy reading assignments, a stiff challenge. It was reported by SOC officials that the students thus admitted were treated no differently from other students on campus, except perhaps for the efforts of advisors to maintain close contact with them. But, as one staff member observed, the students admitted under this policy faded into the student body and the group was not singled out in any way.

There was some speculation at SOC as to whether, if a special program had been available for these students, more of them might have been successful. And one SOC official commented that merely admitting these students to the campus is not the solution to success with them. Special care must be taken, he noted, to provide the special kind of assistance these students require if they are to "bridge" successfully into the institution with some hope of success.

One official who worked closely with them commented: "I would say that by and large their problems are not unique. They are similar to the problems encountered by the general student body, with perhaps one exception - the problem resulting from there being insufficient funds to provide them sufficient of the right kind of student financial aid (e.g., NDEA loans or grants) rather than the work-study jobs that require that time be taken from their school work at a time when they are having some very difficult adjustments to make."

Socially, the three percent program students are reported by institutional representatives to have gotten along very well. Several were active in student government, some were dormitory officers.

SOC reported that those students who stayed on through the winter term and beyond showed significant improvement academically in the winter term over the fall term. Four of the 17 withdrew from SOC for other than academic reasons (family problems, marriage, etc.).

In general, SOC appears to be interested in doing an improved job with these students in the second year of the program. They speak of identifying these students early so that they can be considered for student financial aid of a character that will permit the students to spend their time on their academic work rather than working to maintain themselves in school. SOC seems committeed, too, to making available to these students the fullest tutorial and similar services that the resources of the campus can afford. For SOC sees not only an obligation to seek to contribute to the solution of this major social problem, but it sees, as well, the enhancement of the learning environment at SOC which this diversification of the student body makes possible. SOC comments in particular about the excellent reception given these students by the community and of the eagerness with which community groups sought to learn through the eyes of these students something of the problems to which Ashland has largely been a stranger.

The BOOST Program

The BOOST program was launched at Southern Oregon College in the fall of 1967. Fifty-seven high school students applied and were offered admission, of whom 45 enrolled. Experience with BOOST students has been good according to the registrar and director of admissions.

In 1968-69, 38 BOOST students were enrolled at SOC, 37 fall term, 38 winter, and 35 spring.

- All were residents of Oregon.
- All were high school graduates except one who had a general educational development certificate of equivalency.
- The majority (35) were Caucasian American. Three were black.

The high school grade point averages for 36 of the 38 were reported and were distributed as shown below:

Below 2.00 GPA	0
2.00 - 2.49	5
2.50 - 2.99	20
3.00 - 3.49	8
3.50 - 4.00	3

All met the regular SOC admissions requirements.

To be eligible for financial aid, students must carry at least 12 hours of credit per term. A student is considered to be making reasonable progress toward a degree if he carries a sufficient load to permit him to complete degree requirements in a five-year period.

All of the BOOST students were given some financial aid, but most (33) received only partial aid. Only five received full financial aid.

The aid granted totaled $61,335, of which $46,549 (76 percent) was in the form of federal grants and loans, $11,815 (19 percent) came from state grants, and $2,971 (5 percent) was from private grants.

The $46,549 federal funds came in the following form: NDEA loans, $11,670; work-study funds, $17,815; and opportunity grants, $17,050.

Apart from the financial aid given them, it appears that the BOOST students have access to essentially the same student services as do the SOC students in general. SOC has a tutoring service open to any of its students who seek it out or are referred to it, and this same service is open to BOOST students. It is also reported that a number of faculty have provided special help in the mathematics and science areas.

An SOC official reports that the BOOST students have adapted well to the SOC environment and that there have been no real problems in social adjustment, although some of the BOOST students have had some academic problems (in company with quite a few other students).

Progress of BOOST Students

Of the 38 BOOST students, four had withdrawn for academic reasons by the end of the winter term, and two had withdrawn while in good academic standing.

Thirty-two of 36 BOOST students, for whom we were provided data, were enrolled for 3 terms in 1968-69. Only three had grade point averages below a 2.00.

General Attitude of SOC Toward BOOST

SOC seems enthusiastic about the program and plans to continue as an active participant in it.

University of Oregon
Programs for the Disadvantaged

University of Oregon programs for the disadvantaged include: (1) Upward Bound, (2) three percent admissions program, (3) high school equivalency (HEP) program, (4) BOOST.

Upward Bound

The University of Oregon is a pioneer in the Upward Bound program. It contributed significantly to the thinking that gave birth to Upward Bound as a child of the Office of Economic Opportunity. With Florida A. and M. and New York University, the University shared the distinction of being one of the first three institutions in the United States to launch a federally-funded Upward Bound program (1965-66), and it has been continuously and very actively involved in the program since.

Students To Be Served in the Program

For the most part, the students admitted to the University's Upward Bound program 1965-66 to 1968-69:

- have high school grade point averages that are marginal (more than 50 percent would not be admissable under the University's regular admission requirements),
- are economically disadvantaged,
- appear to institutional personnel to have the ability to profit from university-level educational opportunities.

The Program

The Upward Bound program is, as the guidelines suggest, designed to "generate the skills and motivation necessary for success in education beyond high school among young people from low-income backgrounds and inadequate secondary school preparation."

At the University of Oregon, the program has two aspects: one a summer program of eight weeks, the other a school year program.

Summer Program

The initial summer program at the University of Oregon (1965) was different from subsequent summer Upward Bound programs because it included only high school graduates, whereas subsequent summer programs (1966 through 1969) have included, in addition, holders of certificates of high school equivalency and high school students (freshmen to senior).

- For high school graduates and holders of certificates of high school equivalency involved in the summer program, an effort is made to improve their study and learning skills and to whet their academic appetites in preparation for college admission, hopefully beginning with the fall term following the summer program.

- For high school students, the summer program provides an opportunity for sharpening learning skills, heightening self-confidence, raising the level of aspiration, and motivating them to prepare themselves more effectively in high school for subsequent post-high school opportunities. It is hoped that with new incentive, high school performance will improve and interest in college increase, leading more certainly to the students' achieving more nearly their potential.

Follow-Up of Summer Program Participants

The University seeks to follow up the individuals involved in its summer programs with a view to helping them to maintain their skills and nurture their interest.

- The follow-up of high school graduate participants in the summer program is largely limited to those who are admitted to and enroll in the University of Oregon. It is not feasible to provide for follow-up of those who enroll in other colleges or universities or who drop out of school altogether. With funds and resources generally limited, the University gives first attention to those of its Upward Bound students who are enrolled within the University itself. More is said later concerning the follow-up of these students.

- The follow-up of high school students returning to high school following a summer Upward Bound program at the University consists of periodic calls by a University representative upon the student and his high school counselor, together with some financial assistance. The average amounts reportedly supplied these students (all from federal grants to the University) is shown below:

	1966-67	1967-68	1968-69
Pocket Money	$68	$68	$170
Other, including Board and Room	90	64	45
Health Needs			2
Books and Supplies			10
Travel			32
Medical, Recreation			25
Miscellaneous	19		
	$177	$132	$284

School-Year Program

The Upward Bound school-year program is designed to open to disadvantaged students access to a University education under conditions which give some hope of success.

"Bridging" into the University Program

With students such as are admitted to the University from the Upward Bound program there is urgent need for some form of "bridge" to carry them from where they are in their attainments upward to the point where they can join onto the University's regular program and compete on a reasonably even basis with other students who have come through the traditional routes into the university environment.

This "bridge" consists of: remedial courses, "simulated" university courses, special "adapted" university courses, special counseling, and tutoring and other mechanisms for giving special support to Upward Bound and other disadvantaged students at the University.

- The remedial courses are precisely what the title implies. They are intended to remedy shortcomings in the student's background and to bring him within hailing distance of the competence in basic skills (writing, computation, and the like) necessary to his benefiting from what the University has to offer. Remedial courses of this kind carry no University credit.

- The "simulated" university courses provide the student the opportunity to familiarize himself with university life under more ideal conditions than obtain in the traditional university classroom. Illustrative of the simulated courses offered in one or more years of the Upward Bound program are the following:

  Creative Writing
  U. S. History & Readings in Western Civilization
  Introduction to Literature
  Introduction to Sociology

  Such "simulated" courses generally carry no University credit.

- Special "adapted" university courses were developed following two years of experience with the Upward Bound program. Illustrative of these courses are the following:

  English: Writing 10
  Writing 80
  Sociology
  Political Science

  Unlike the remedial and simulated university courses, these special "adapted" courses do carry credit toward graduation, although not toward specific requirements.

  These "adapted" courses were clearly a response from the University to some unmet needs of the disadvantaged students. Professor J. C. Sherwood, chairman of the powerful University committee on the curriculum, in a memorandum written in 1968, entitled "Curriculum for the Disadvantaged," describes in the following words the need for such courses, the nature of the courses required, and the use to be made of them:

  > The curriculum represents a response to an emergency situation which came to the attention of the Committee during the summer. We shall have on campus this fall a group of perhaps 130-150 students admitted outside the ordinary admissions procedures and more often than not at a serious disadvantage in competing in the standard curriculum. The committee could see at least two possible outcomes of this situation, neither of them desirable: that the students would simply fail, or that they would be kept on artificially by devices which would be subversive of academic standards without offering the

student an opportunity to become genuinely educated. To avoid these alternatives, certain departments have undertaken to offer a small group of courses intended especially to develop skills and to bring the disadvantaged student as rapidly as possible to the point where he can pursue a normal degree program without special help. Insofar as these are not simply adaptations of existing courses, they are offered this fall with emergency approval and, if continued, will come before the faculty in the usual manner.

The courses will be no-grade, but unlike older remedial courses, they will carry full credit for graduation, though not toward specific requirements. A passing grade will usually imply a readiness to take similar courses in the regular curriculum. The courses will be taught at the highest level compatible with morale.

The courses are aimed at those who are admitted irregularly; admission of others will be a matter of department policy. It is assumed that most students admitted will be members of minority groups, and materials will be chosen to appeal to their interests. No student is required to take any of these courses; those able to handle regular courses are urged to proceed directly. Advisers will attempt some screening, but under faculty regulations, the final choice is the students. Students who fail the English placement test and fall in the special category may choose between a special writing course and the standard Wr 10.

The degree of temporary segregation in the program is accepted not as desirable in itself but as a necessary expedient to ensure the survival of certain students; it will usually be partial, since the special curriculum will seldom constitute a full load. The use of a certain content (such as minority literature) at this level implies nothing about the value of this material, which will in any case be offered at other levels.

At the moment it is expected that courses will be offered in writing, reading (literature), social science.

- Although not so designated, there are some other University courses that play an important role in assisting disadvantaged students in "bridging" into the University. Designed for, and appealing to the student body at large, these courses have a very strong pull upon disadvantaged youth. These are courses the subject matter content of which is living and pulsing; as up-to-date as the morning's telecast subjects; issues and problems with which many disadvantaged students have been in contact from earliest memory (e.g., life styles of the poor, marginal youth, alienated youth, poverty solutions, racism in America, black power, urban unrest). They tend to be taught by persons of magnetic personality who appeal to and have great empathy for disadvantaged youth; they tend to be conducted on the basis of group work with perhaps less emphasis on individual work than is true in many courses; they often use as the basis for student evaluation group effort rather than primarily individual effort; they tend to be of a character which gives the abilities of disadvantaged youth more opportunity to shine through than is true in some of the more traditionally organized and administered courses. For these and perhaps other reasons the disadvantaged youth may achieve better grades in these courses than in some others in which he may be enrolled. And these better grades provide the disadvantaged student with a useful offset against the more traditional courses in which he may do less well.

- The counseling offered Upward Bound students is designed to give them special assistance in the usual matters relating to student needs, but in particular to help them develop in self-confidence and motivation. It is a demanding task even for one who has a special understanding of the special needs of disadvantaged students. For one who does not, it is a virtually impossible task.

- We have in an earlier section of this report referred to the important part that tutoring must play in bringing to the disadvantaged students that extra increment of support that he needs. Tutoring at the University of Oregon has engaged the interest of a large number of volunteer students who are committed to serving the needs of their fellow students. The University reports that in a single year as many as 500 students have thus been involved.

In the first year of the University's Upward Bound program (1965-66), federal funding was available for the "bridge" program (Upward Bound grant was $283,891 but in subsequent years the grant was considerably reduced (to roughly $117,750 total for the 1968 summer and 1968-69 school year, for instance), so that such "bridging" as has been provided since then has been heavily dependent upon the University. The special "adapted" programs described above illustrate the efforts the University has made to meet this need.

Student Credit Load in Upward Bound

Students enrolled in the University of Oregon school-year Upward Bound program are expected to carry a minimum of 12 credit hours of work per term to qualify for grants, loans, or work-study assistance. The University also asserts that to remain eligible for student financial aid, the student must make "reasonable progress" toward a bachelor's degree during each year he is in attendance at the University. Reasonable progress is interpreted to mean that the student should carry such academic loads as well permit him to meet graduation requirements in five years, which, equated on an annual basis, means approximately 37-40 credit hours per year.

Number Enrolled in Upward Bound

The number enrolled in the University Upward Bound program classified according to academic status at time of entry is shown in TABLE V.

TABLE V

NUMBER ENROLLED IN UPWARD BOUND, BY ACADEMIC STATUS
AT TIME OF ENTRY, 1965-66 to 1968-69

Status	1965-66		1966-67		1967-68		1968-69	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
H. S. Freshman	--	--	--	--	--	--	4	5.9
H. S. Sophomore	--	--	--	--	5	5.8	13	19.4
H. S. Junior	--	--	13	9.9	19	21.8	18	26.9
H. S. Senior	--	--	1	.8	15	17.3	1	1.5
H. S. Graduate	77	98.7	77	58.8	24	27.6	13	19.4
GED Certificate	1	1.3	23	17.6	11	12.6	16	23.9
Unreported	--	--	17	12.9	13	14.9	2	3.0
Total	78	100.0	131	100.0	87	100.0	67	100.0

It will be observed that the total number enrolled in the Upward Bound programs (summer and school-year combined) was as follows:

1965-66	78	1967-68	87
1966-67	131	1968-69	67

Table V also reveals that over the four-year period from 1965-66 to 1968-69 a decreasing proportion of the students enrolled are high school graduates or holders of a GED certificate of high school equivalency, and an increasing proportion are high school students. In 1965-69, 100 percent (78) of the students in the program were high school graduates or possessors of a GED certificate. In succeeding years, corresponding percentages were: 1966-67, 76.4 percent; 1967-68, 40.2 percent; 1968-69, 43.3 percent.

This trend is expressive of the University's desire to put an increasing proportion of its Upward Bound resources into seeking out promising young high school students who need the encouragement of the Upward Bound program during their high school years if they are to lift their eyes toward a university education and prepare for it. This trend is particularly apparent in the 1968-69 figures, which show that 5.9 percent of the students with the Upward Bound program were high school freshmen, 19.4 percent were high school sophomores, and 26.9 percent high school juniors.

Ethnic Background of Upward Bound Students

The two largest ethnic groups among the Upward Bound students are Caucasian Americans and Black Americans, followed in turn by American Indians and Mexican Americans (Table VI).

TABLE VI

DISTRIBUTION OF UNIVERSITY OF OREGON UPWARD BOUND STUDENTS ACCORDING TO ETHNIC BACKGROUND, 1965-66 to 1968-69

Ethnic Background	1965-66		1966-67		1967-68		1968-69	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Caucasian American	34	43.6	60	45.8	37	42.6	26	38.8
Black American	38	48.7	45	34.3	23	26.4	23	34.3
American Indian	--	--	15	11.5	24	27.6	13	19.4
Mexican American	5	6.4	10	7.6	1	1.1	3	4.5
Hawaiian	1	1.3	1	.8	--	--	1	1.5
Unreported	--	--	--	--	2	2.3	1	1.5
Total	78	100.0	131	100.0	87	100.0	67	100.0

Basis of Admission to University of Oregon From Upward Bound Program

It is essential to clarify at this point certain facts concerning the number of students involved in the Upward Bound program as distinguished from those who were admitted to the University of Oregon as regular students from the Upward Bound program.

Let us begin with the figures from the immediately preceding tables. They show the combined figures for the summer program and the school year following as follows:

Summer 1965 and 1965-66	78
Summer 1966 and 1966-67	131
Summer 1967 and 1967-68	87
Summer 1968 and 1968-69	67

The foregoing figures consist of two categories of individuals, as shown below: (1) high school graduates or holders of a certificate of high school equivalency or equivalent, and (2) nonhigh school graduates:

	Total in Upward Bound	High School Graduates or Holders of Certificate of Equivalency	Nonhigh School Graduates
1965-66	78	78	-
1966-67	131	100	31
1967-68	87	35	52
1968-69	67	30	37

Now, what happened to these high school graduates and the holders of a certificate of equivalency? How many went on to school? How many did not? Of those who went on to school, how many were admitted to the University of Oregon? On what basis were they admitted (i.e., on the basis of regular admission requirements or on the basis of the special dispensation provided for in the three percent program)? What has been their scholastic record at the university? What has been the attrition rate among those entering the university? These are questions to which we now seek to respond.

In TABLE VII we have shown the number of Upward Bound students who were subsequently admitted to the University as regular students, and their attrition rate.

It will be seen from TABLE VII that:

- The proportion of the total number of high school graduates or holders of a certificate of high school equivalency, or equivalent, in the Upward Bound program who subsequently enroll in the University of Oregon has declined from year to year, and that the proportion enrolling in community colleges or vocational-technical schools has increased, although the numbers are small in the latter case.

TABLE VII

ENROLLMENT, RETENTION, AND WITHDRAWAL RATES OF STUDENTS ADMITTED TO THE UNIVERSITY OF OREGON FROM UPWARD BOUND PROGRAM, 1965-66 to 1968-69

Enrollment Status	Upward Bound Program for Summer and School Year	Enrollment Status of Students Admitted to University from Upward Bound			
		1965-66	1966-67	1967-68	1968-69
1	2	3	4	5	6
Number of Students Attending University of Oregon	1965-66	71	16	6	6
	1966-67		68	42[a]	26
	1967-68			20	15
	1968-69				16
		71	84	68	63
Students attending a Community College or Voc-Tech School	1965-66	1	2	1	1
	1966-67		1	2	3
	1967-68			5	5
	1968-69				10
		1	3	8	19
Number of Students Unaccounted For	1965-66	6	60	71	71
	1966-67		31	59	74
	1967-68			10	19[b]
	1968-69				4
		6	91	140	168

---

[a] Sixty-eight of the 1966-67 summer-school year Upward Bound program entered the University as university students in 1966-67. An additional 19 students who had participated in the 1966-67 Upward Bound program entered in 1967-68, and are included in the 42 shown as enrolled in 1967-68.

[b] Four students who had been part of the 1967-68 Upward Bound program did not enter the University as university students until 1968-69.

The above table should be read as follows: Of the combined total enrollment in the Upward Bound program for summer and school year of 1965-66, 71 (91.0 percent of the total) entered the University of Oregon as university students in 1965-66. Of this 71, there remained 16 in 1966-67, 6 in 1967-68, and 6 in 1968-69. Of the total students enrolled in the summer-school year Upward Bound program 1966-1967, 68 entered the University of Oregon as university students in 1967-68. An additional 19 from the 1966-67 Upward Bound program entered the University of Oregon as university students in 1967-68 and are included in the 42 shown as enrolled that year.

  - In 1965-66, 71 (91.0 percent) of the total of 78 high school graduates and GED certificate holders in the Upward Bound program entered the University as university students, only one was reported to have enrolled in a community college or voc-tech school.

  - In 1966-67, 68 (68 percent) of a total of 100 high school graduates and GED certificate holders in Upward Bound entered the University of Oregon; one entered a community college or voc-tech school.

    Subsequently (1967-68) 19 more from the 1966-67 Upward Bound program entered the University of Oregon (three of whom had not completed high school in time to be admitted in 1966-67).

  - In 1967-68, 20 (57.1 percent) of a total of 35 high school graduates and GED holders entered the University of Oregon. An additional four of the 1967-68 Upward Bound program students who had not completed high school in time to enter the University in 1967-68 were admitted and enrolled in 1968-69; five enrolled in a community college or voc-tech school.

  - In 1968-69, 16 (53.5 percent) of a total of 30 high school graduates and GED holders entered the University of Oregon; 10 (33.3 percent) entered a community college or voc-tech school.

- The attrition rate of students entering the University of Oregon has been quite high among the students admitted in the first two years of the program.

  - Of 71 enrolled in 1965-66, six remained in 1968-69.

  - Of 87 from the 1966-67 Upward Bound program who enrolled in the University (68 in 1966-67, an additional 19 in 1967-68), there remained 26 in 1968-69.

  - Of 24 students from the 1967-68 Upward Bound program who entered the University of Oregon (20 in 1967-68; four in 1968-69), there were 15 enrolled in 1968-69.

  - Of the 20 students from the 1968-69 Upward Bound program who were admitted to the University in that year, 16 enrolled in 1968-69.

Fragmentary information from the University Upward Bound office indicated that there were two or three other Upward Bound students who were known to have entered other four-year institutions than the University of Oregon, but so fragmentary was the information that we chose not to include it here. Nor was there available any substantive information as to the present status of those who dropped out of the university. Presumably some may have entered other schools, some may have taken employment, some are perhaps in the service, others married and occupied as housewives, but there is not accurate up-to-date information on these matters, so that in TABLE IV we simply recorded as "unaccounted for" any Upward Bound students who did not enter the University of Oregon or a community college or vocational-technical school, whose transcript records could readily be checked by the Board's office.

Basis of Admission of Upward Bound Students to University of Oregon

In the four years 1965-66 to 1968-69, 194 Upward Bound students were admitted into the University of Oregon as regular university students. Data were available as to high school grade point average, scholastic aptitude test scores, or general educational development test scores, for 182 (93.8 percent) of the 194 admitted. An analysis of these data reveals the fact that of these 182 students, 77 (42.3 percent) were admissible under the regular admission requirements of the institution (TABLE VIII).

- Forty-one (22.5 percent) were admissible on the basis of their having a high school grade point average of 2.25 or higher.
- Twenty-seven (14.8 percent) had scholastic aptitude test scores in excess of the 887 required to residents for fall term admission.
- Seven (3.9 percent) had completed the general educational development test with an average score of 55.
- Two who were transferees from college had grade point averages on that work in excess of that required of resident transfer students.

Resident Status of Upward Bound Students Admitted to University

The overwhelming majority of the Upward Bound students admitted into the University of Oregon as regular university students were residents of Oregon (TABLE IX).

- Sixty-eight (95.8 percent) of the 71 students enrolled in 1965-66 (resident status of the remaining 4.2 percent was unreported).
- Seventy-five (86.2 percent) of the 87 students from the 1966-67 programs enrolled in 1966-67 and 1967-68 (resident status of 6.9 percent of the students was unreported).
- Twenty-three (95.8 percent) of the 24 students from the 1967-68 program enrolled in 1967-68 and 1968-69.
- Eight (50 percent) of the 16 from 1968-69 program enrolled in 1968-69 (resident status of 6.2 percent was unreported).

TABLE VIII

BASIS OF ADMISSION OF THE UPWARD BOUND STUDENTS ADMITTED TO THE UNIVERSITY OF OREGON

Basis of Admission to University of Oregon	Number of Students Admitted to University on Basis Indicated				Total	
	1965-66	1966-67	1967-68	1968-69	No.	%
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
High School grade point average (2.25 or above)	15	18	4	4	41	22.5
Scholastic Aptitude Test Scores (887 or above)	12	7	2	6	27	14.8
General Educational Development Test Scores (55 or above)	-	5	2	-	7	3.9
College Transfer Grade Point Average	-	-	-	2	2	1.1
Admissible Only on Basis of Special Dispensation of Three Percent Program	43	48	11	3	105	57.7
Total	70[a]	78[b]	19[c]	15[d]	182	100.0

[a] One was unreported, making total of 71.
[b] Nine were unreported, making total of 87. Of these 68 were admitted to the University in 1966-67; 19 in 1967-68.
[c] One was unreported, making total of 20.
[d] One was unreported, making a total of 16.

Financial Support for the Upward Bound Program

Financial support for the Upward Bound program consists of the support needed to meet: (1) the operating costs of the program (director's salary, office help, and the like, exclusive of student financial aid), and (2) the student financial aid requirements.

Operating Costs. The operating costs of the program consist of: (1) the direct budget funds, and (2) contributed effort expressed in terms of dollar figures. The direct budget funds in support of the Upward Bound program were all provided by the federal government (TABLE X). They ranged from a high of $97,354 provided for the 1965-66 school year program to a low of $11,331 provided in the 1966-67 school year. The total provided by the federal government beginning with the summer of 1965 and extending through the school year 1968-69 was $337,944 (73.4 percent of the combined total of direct budget and contributed effort).

TABLE IX

RESIDENT STATUS OF UPWARD BOUND STUDENTS ADMITTED TO UNIVERSITY OF OREGON

Resident Status	Number and Percent of Students 1965-66 No.	 1965-66 %	 1966-67 No.	 1966-67 %	 1967-68 No.	 1967-68 %	 1968-69 No.	 1968-69 %
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Resident	68	95.8	65	95.6	19	95.0	8	50.0
Nonresident	-	-	2	2.9	1	5.0	7	43.8
Unreported	3	4.2	1	1.5	-	-	1	6.2
Total	71	100.0	68[a]	100.0	20[b]	100.0	16	100.0

[a] An additional 19 students (12 residents, 2 nonresidents and 5 whose resident status was unreported) from the 1966-67 Upward Bound program enrolled in 1967-68 for the first time.

[b] An additional four students (all residents) from the 1967-68 Upward Bound program enrolled in 1968-69 for the first time.

TABLE X

OPERATING COSTS OF THE UPWARD BOUND PROGRAM, 1965-66 to 1968-69

(Director's salary, office help, and other operating costs exclusive of aid to students.)

Program by Period	Cost in Dollars Direct Budget Amount	 Direct Budget %	 Contributed Effort Amount	 Contributed Effort %	 Total Amount	 Total %
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1965 Summer	$46,058	80.9	$ 5,876	19.1	$51,934	100.0
1965-66 School Year	97,354	77.7	28,003	22.3	125,357	100.0
1966 Summer	42,261	100.0	0	0	42,261	100.0
1966-67 School Year	11,331	20.8	43,218	79.2	54,549	100.0
1967 Summer	28,208	87.4	4,073	12.6	32,281	100.0
1967-68 School Year	49,645	80.4	12,099	19.6	61,744	100.0
1968 Summer	27,831	70.5	11,620	29.5	39,451	100.0
1968-69 School Year	35,256	66.4	17,817	33.6	53,073	100.0
Total	$337,994	73.4	$122,706	26.6	$460,650	100.0

Contributed effort from the University has ranged from an estimated high of $43,218 in 1966-67 to zero in the summer of 1966. The estimated total of contributed effort for the period from the 1965 summer to the close of 1968-69 was $122,706 (26.6 percent of the combined total of direct budget funds and contributed effort).

Student Financial Aid. Student financial aid funds in support of Upward Bound students consist of three kinds of funds, to assist three different categories of students, as follows:

- The Upward Bound students on campus during the summer term. Support for these students was provided by the Office of Economic Opportunity and amounted to the following sums:

	Amount	%
Summer 1965	$33,321	26.8
Summer 1966	25,125	20.2
Summer 1967	30,510	24.6
Summer 1968	35,289	28.4
Total	$124,245	100.0

- The Upward Bound students who upon completion of a summer program on campus returned to their high school programs the ensuing school year. Funds were supplied by the Office of Economic Opportunity in the following amounts:

	Amount	%
1966-67	$13,237	32.3
1967-68	8,312	20.3
1968-69	19,374	47.4
Total	$40,923	100.0

- The Upward Bound students who were admitted into the University of Oregon as regular students. The amount and the source of the funds received for this purpose was as follows:

	Amount	%
Federal grants, loans, work-study	$370,286	97.6
State system grants	772	.2
Institutional grants	8,420	2.2
Total	$379,478	100.0

The form in which this assistance was given to students is revealed in TABLE XI, page 85. It will be noted that educational opportunity grants and OEO grants together constituted approximately 53 percent of the aid, and work-study 25 percent, and loans approximately 19 percent.

Scholastic Achievement at the University

We are aware that some object to the use of the cumulative grade point average as a measure of the academic achievement of students. The difficulties of assessing student growth and achievement are everywhere recognized. Yet, as our institutions are presently constituted, cumulative grade point

TABLE XI

STUDENT FINANCIAL AID GRANTED
UPWARD BOUND STUDENTS 1965-66 to 1968-69

	Amount of Aid Given					
Form of Aid	1965-66	1966-67	1967-68	1968-69	Total	%
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Student Loan						
NDEA	-	$2,700	$28,702	$36,175	$67,577	17.9
Guaranteed	-	-	900	3,600	4,500	1.2
Other	-	-	-	-	-	
Work Study	$2,807	22,823	23,831	46,543	96,004	25.3
Educational Opportunity Grant	-	3,068	19,618	33,487	56,173	14.8
State Scholarship	-	-	420	352	772	.2
Institutional Scholarship (Endowment & Grant)	-	6,914	1,014	492	8,420	2.2
OEO Grants	107,158	38,874	-	-	146,032	38.4
Total	$109,965	$74,379	$74,485	$120,649	$379,478	100.0

average is the index in terms of which retention standards are set, and it is, therefore, the best "objective" measure that we have for inquiring as to the academic achievement of Upward Bound students.

We have earlier noted the attrition rate among Upward Bound students. An exmination of their cumulative grade point averages provides useful background information in terms of which that attrition rate can be understood. We have therefore sought to summarize the information on academic achievement of the 194 students who have, during the period 1965-66 to 1968-69, been admitted to the University from the Upward Bound program (TABLE XII, p. 87).

As might be anticipated, cumulative grade point averages of Upward Bound students who have completed but three or four terms tend to be low. These students have serious adjustments to make to a new and different environment during those first few terms, and despite the special assistance given them - tutoring service, special counseling, access to some courses that are designed to reflect the special needs and the special competencies of the Upward Bound student - many find that the University program is most challenging. Grade point averages tend to be low. Then attrition works its will and as it does so, those students who survive into the latter part of the second year or the third or fourth year find that with the special help that is given to them, they are able to continue in the mainstream of students at the university.

Institutional Plans

The University of Oregon is committed to the Upward Bound program. It is in process of a detailed evaluation of its experience with the program and will, from this evaluation, hope to improve its success with the students enrolled in Upward Bound. As we earlier noted, the University has been in the forefront of the national Upward Bound movement from the outset. Its experience to the present appears to the University to confirm the wisdom of its efforts, particularly because of the promise that further experience holds out.

TABLE XII

CREDITS EARNED AND CUMULATIVE GRADE POINT AVERAGES OF STUDENTS ADMITTED TO UNIVERSITY OF OREGON FROM UPWARD BOUND PROGRAM 1965-66 to 1968-69

Number Terms Completed 1	Number of Students 2	Credits Toward Graduation 3	Cumulative Grade Point Average 4
0	7	0	0
1	30	Range 0-16 Median 8	9 students - zero GPA 9 students - below 1.00 6 students - 1.00 - 2.00 7 students - 2.00 or above
2	32	Range 0-25 Median 9	4 students - zero GPA 12 students - below 1.00 8 students - 1.00 - 1.99 6 students - 2.00 - 2.99 2 students - 3.00 or above
3	58	Range 4 - 90 Median 22.5	5 students - below 1.00 33 students - 1.00 - 1.99 18 students - 2.00 - 2.99 2 students - 3.00 or above
4	19	Range 9-78 Median 34	2 students - below 1.00 10 students - 1.00 - 1.99 4 students - 2.00 - 2.99 3 students - 3.00 or above
5	7	Range 16 - 72 Median 32	3 students - 1.00 - 1.99 4 students - 2.00 - 2.99
6	15	Range 41 - 137 Median 71	12 students - 2.00 - 2.99 3 students - 3.00 or above
7	6	Range 62 - 96 Median 81	3 students - 2.00 - 2.99 3 students - 3.00 or above
8	4	Range 57-195 Median 108	3 students - 2.00 - 2.99 1 student - 3.00 or above
9	6	Range 77 - 117 Median 97.5	1 student - 1.00 - 1.99 3 students - 2.00 - 2.99 2 students - 3.00 or above
10	3	Range 100-178 Median 126	2 students - 2.00 - 2.99 1 student - 3.00 or above
11	-	-	-
12	5	Range 84-190 Median 166	5 students - 2.00 - 2.99
13	1	119	1 student - 2.00 - 2.99

Three Percent Admissions Program

The University of Oregon uses a significant portion of its three percent admissions program to recruit "high risk" students under the general program title "Project 75." The University describes the project program as follows:

> Project 75 has been directed toward several goals. First, it is the intention of this program to recruit as many disadvantaged youths within the 150 quota as possible, primarily residents of the Portland low-income community, providing academic support as they matriculate into the University of Oregon. The recruiting and supportive services will be expanded to include Indians, Mexicans, and low-income White Americans, with recruitment effort made on a broader basis as compared to the first year program. The ultimate goal of the project is to see that each of the program participants completes his four year requirements and obtains a degree - whether here or at some other institution in Oregon. It is our hope that the program will be perpetuated by the student participants, as an ever continuing channel through which low-income, "high risk," disadvantaged students can enter the University of Oregon, confident that the support services are available should they be needed. It is our hope that through our community relations program, through research programs, dissertations or other publicity, the success of this program will excel in the eyes of this country, and what will have taken place here on the University of Oregon campus can be used as a model, and as a positive method toward educational change and constructive student participation.

Program objectives are as follows:

1. To recruit and maintain minority and disadvantaged youths to the University of Oregon undergraduate program.

2. To provide a training and retaining program, designed to develop skilled minority personnel through task force (working with the minority and disadvantaged students at the University of Oregon) and seminar procedures, thereby creating a productive and steady work force as well as provide the academic support necessary to the "high risk" student in pursuit of higher education.

3. To prepare citizens, enabling them to return to the community demonstrating practical application toward the development and enhancement of its people.

4. To provide support services for the minority students enrolled at the University of Oregon under the auspices of this program.

5. To show that through close academic advising and tutoring services, so called "high risk" students can complete four years of college.

6. To increase the number of disadvantaged and minority students presently enrolled at the University of Oregon, thereby decreasing the number of youths leading idle and meaningless lives; to decrease the Nation's waste, allowing more of these youths the opportunity of attending college, obtaining a degree, and developing a sense of "self-worth."

7. To establish a Community Relations work-shop, bringing together parents and teachers from the low-income community with Project staff and University personnel, to develop a two-way flow of involvement, responsibility and accountability between the "target" communities and institutions providing higher education for members of that community.

8. To reach the conscience of the citizens, to seek the commitment of the more fortunate people, securing adequate funding to the following (Student or Program support):

    a. The financing of at least one disadvantaged student through a four-year college program or some part thereof.

    b. A grant, funding some part of the operational cost of this program.

    c. A fellowship to increase graduate assistance to the program.

Seventy-three students were recruited for the three percent program in 1968-69, the first year of the program.

- Fifty-seven of the 73 (78.1 percent) were residents of Oregon.

- Fifty-six (76.7 percent) were high school graduates, 15 (20.6 percent) were college dropouts, and two (2.7 percent) had completed the General Educational Development test, a test taken by those who do not have a high school diploma as a basis for qualifying for a certificate of high school equivalency.

- Eighteen of the 70 for whom high school grade point averages were available (25.7 percent) had grade point averages of 2.25 or higher, which qualified them for admission to the University under the admission requirements applying to resident students. Of the remaining 52 students, not admissible on the basis of high school grade point average, four had Scholastic Aptitude test scores of 887 or more, qualifying them for regular admission on that basis. Thus, there were 48 of the 70 for whom data were available (68.6 percent) who were admissible only under the terms of the three percent admissions program, which permits institutions to admit students without regard to whether or not they meet regular admission standards.

- The largest ethnic group included among the 73 students was Black American (72.6 percent), followed in turn by Caucasian American (21.9 percent), and American Indian (5.5 percent), as shown below:

	No.	%
Black American	53	72.6
Caucasian American	16	21.9
American Indian	4	5.5
Total	73	100.0

- Sixty-nine of the 73 students (94.5 percent) received some financial aid - 62 full financial aid, seven partial aid. The average amount of aid for the Project 75 students was $533 per term; for non-Project 75 students among the three percent admissions program group, $433 per term.

  The total amount of student financial aid reportedly provided the three percent program students in 1968-69 was $140,610 - of which 82.6 percent ($116,112) was from federal grants, loans, work-study funds; the remaining 17.4 percent ($24,498) was from other sources (private).

  The form in which the student financial aid was granted is as follows:

	Amount	%
NDEA Loans	$46,843	33.3
Guaranteed Loans	650	.5
Work-Study Funds	28,580	20.3
Education Opportunity Grant	40,689	28.9
Other - Athletic Grants	23,848	17.0
Total	$140,610	100.0

Academic Achievement

As might be anticipated, the load in regular University courses carried by the students enrolled in the three percent admissions program varies widely. The institutional policy is reported to be that the three percent admissions program students should complete 12 credits per term and 36 credits in the academic year. However, in the interests of serving the special needs of these students, considerable more flexibility is allowed them in course load than the general policy statement would suggest.

Of the 73 students enrolled in the program, two are reported to have withdrawn in the fall, four in the winter and ten in the spring. Of this total of 16 who withdrew, eight withdrew because of academic deficiencies.

We report the academic records of these students expressed in terms of the credit earned and cumulative grade point average in TABLE XIII, p. 91.

TABLE XIII

GRADE POINT AVERAGES AND CREDITS EARNED BY STUDENTS ENROLLED IN THE UO THREE PERCENT ADMISSIONS PROGRAM, 1968-69

Number of Terms Completed 1	Number of Students 2	Credits Earned in Regular Courses 3	Cumulative Grade Point Averages 4
3	58	49	4.00
		48	2.14
		47	2.89
		45	3.35
		44	3.27
		43	2.49
		41	3.07
		40	3.20, 3.25, 2.72
		39	2.64, 3.28, 2.92, 2.35
		38	2.81, 2.21, 2.44
		37	2.56, 3.18, 2.94
		36	3.22, 2.27, 2.19, 1.86
		35	1.85, 2.77, 2.71
		34	2.61, 3.50, 2.23, 2.61, 1.88, 2.79
		33	2.00, 2.93, 3.22, 2.33
		32	1.90, 3.15
		31	2.51, 2.74
		30	2.16, 1.76
		29	2.51, 2.20, 2.27
		28	2.46
		27	3.18
		26	2.69, 2.84
		24	2.54, 1.70
		23	1.86
		22	1.95
		21	2.85
		18	2.16, 2.38
		10	2.30
2	11	26	1.03
		22	2.31
		20	2.45
		16	1.81
		15	2.60
		13	2.07
		12	2.00, 2.00
		8	.37
		6	.50, 2.50
		0	0
1	3	11	2.36
		0	0, 0
0	1	0	0

It will be observed from TABLE XIII that:

- Fifty-eight of the 73 students (80.8 percent) had completed three terms of work by the end of spring term 1968-69; 11, two terms; and three, one term.
- Of the 59 students (80.8 percent) who completed three terms, 51 (86.4 percent) had a cumulative grade point average of 2.00 or higher.

  Not all of the 59 students carried an average of 12 credit hours or more per term. Of the 24 (40.7 percent) who did, however, 23 (95.8 percent) had a cumulative GPA of 2.00 or more. Of these 23, 14 had a cumulative GPA of from 2.00 to 2.99; nine had a cumulative GPA of 3.00 or higher.

Special Services Provided
Three Percent Admissions Students

The University reports that special tutorial services were offered students in the three percent admissions program,and that special assistance was given them in the development of study skills. Special counseling was also offered, including academic advising, personal, and social counseling. Advisors sought to retain a particularly close relationship with these students, acting as their advocates during the early stages of their campus experience, until the students could get a reasonable grasp of their surroundings.

A special institutional committee, entitled the Committee on the Curriculum for Disadvantaged Students, which was established in 1969, has sought to give leadership to the development of campus conditions that will offer disadvantaged students generally the maximum opportunity to succeed. Three departments which have representation on the committee - political science, sociology, and English - have provided tutors for disadvantaged students enrolling in lower-division courses in these departments.

Institutional Plans

University of Oregon officials are of the view that the three percent admissions policy is a useful one - that the University has an obligation to seek to find effective ways of working with students who, although not possessed of the usual evidences of academic ability as reflected in high school grade point average or scholastic aptitude test score, nonetheless are felt by those who are acquainted with them to have qualities which would permit them to succeed at the collegiate level, if they are given special assistance.

University officials are confident that as they gain experience, these programs for the disadvantaged can be made more productive, more effective, more efficient.

High School Equivalency (HEP) Program

The high school equivalency (HEP) program is available in the state system only at the University of Oregon, which has offered the program since 1967-68.

The program is open generally to young people aged 17-22 years who have not completed high school. The program is designed to prepare them to pass the General Educational Development (GED) test, which qualifies them for a state department of education certificate of equivalency. This certificate is accepted generally by colleges and universities as a basis for admission in lieu of a high school diploma and is considered by many employers to be the equivalent of a high school diploma.

Ninety-one (91) students were admitted to the HEP program each year, 1967-68 and 1968-69. Those admitted were economically disadvantaged, most being from migrant or seasonally employed agricultural worker families.

Background of Students

In both years, Mexican Americans were the largest ethnic group in the program (just over 40 percent each year), followed closely by Caucasian Americans (37.4 percent and 30.8 percent in 1967-68 and 1968-69 respectively). American Indians and Black Americans were 15.4 percent and 6.6 percent respectively of the total in 1967-68, and 15.4 percent and 13.2 percent, respectively, in 1968-69 (TABLE XIV).

TABLE XIV

SUMMARY DISTRIBUTION OF HEP STUDENTS BY ETHNIC BACKGROUND

Ethnic Background	1967-1968		1968-1969	
	No.	%	No.	%
1	2	3	4	5
Mexican American	37	40.6	37	40.6
Caucasian American	34	37.4	28	30.8
American Indian	14	15.4	14	15.4
Black American	6	6.6	12	13.2
Total	91	100.0	91	100.0

Formal Education Upon Admission

The students' level of formal education at time of admission to HEP is shown in TABLE XV.

TABLE XV

SUMMARY DISTRIBUTION OF HEP STUDENTS BY AMOUNT OF FORMAL EDUCATION

Formal Schooling	1967-1968		1968-1969	
	No.	%	No.	%
1	2	3	4	5
5th grade or less	1	1.1	5	5.5
More than 5th; less than 9th	21	23.1	28	30.8
9th grade	25	27.4	25	27.4
10th grade	23	25.3	21	23.1
11th grade	21	23.1	12	13.2
Total	91	100.0	91	100.0

Just over one-third (36.3 percent) of the HEP students admitted in 1968-69 had less than a ninth grade education at the time of admission. The largest concentration were students with a ninth or tenth grade education. These, combined, constituted 50.5 percent of the total HEP students admitted in 1968-69.

Duration of Training

HEP students were involved in the program for varying lengths of time ranging from 6 weeks to 12 months (TABLE XVI).

Of those students in the HEP program in 1968-69, approximately 30 percent (29.7 percent) were in the program for 6 weeks or less. A roughly similar percentage were in the program for 12 weeks to 6 months (30.8 percent). Only 15.3 percent were in the program for 9 to 12 months.

TABLE XVI

SUMMARY DISTRIBUTION OF DURATION OF TRAINING RECEIVED BY HEP STUDENTS

Time in Program	1967-1968		1968-1969	
	No.	%	No.	%
1	2	3	4	5
6 weeks or less	25	27.4	27	29.7
6 to 12 weeks	3	3.3	1	1.1
12 weeks to 6 months	10	11.1	28	30.8
6 to 9 months	16	17.6	21	23.1
9 to 12 months	37	40.6	14	15.3
Total	91	100.0	91	100.0

Student Progress

We are reporting progress of the HEP program students in terms of:

- The number who completed or are in process of completing the General Educational Development test, which qualifies them for a high school equivalency certificate, opening up to them access to educational and employment opportunities that would not otherwise be available to them.
- The number who subsequently went on to further education at the University of Oregon or other institutions or schools.
- The scholastic record of those who entered the University of Oregon upon completion of the HEP program.

We acknowledge that the foregoing do not form a wholly adequate basis for evaluation of the HEP program. Not even if we had full and complete information on each of these three measures, which, unfortunately, we do not. Consider the measure of the number of HEP students completing the GED test who go on to further education. We know how many went on immediately to the University of Oregon and to some nearby schools such as Lane Community College. But we do not know how many of those who did not enter these schools entered schools elsewhere, and we cannot know now how many of these HEP students who did not immediately continue their education may later do so. Moreover, we have no knowledge as to how the employment opportunities for those who elected to go immediately into employment have been or may in the future be improved as a result of the HEP experience, or how the general quality of life has been altered by the HEP experience. It is with these kinds of cautions in mind, that we provide such evidence as we have been able to secure as to the experience of the HEP students, as these experiences are reflected in the three measures cited above.

Number Who Completed GED Test

The progress of the students enrolled in the HEP program expressed in terms of the number of those who entered the program who subsequently completed the GED test is shown in tabular form as follows:

	1967-68		1968-69	
	No.	%	No.	%
Number admitted to HEP program	91	100.0	91	100.0
Number dropped from program without completing GED test	27	29.7	24	26.4
Number still enrolled as of August 1, and planning to take GED test in the future	26	28.6	34	37.4
Number who had completed the GED test	38	41.7	33	36.2

It will be observed from the above tabulation that 64 of the 91 (70.3 percent) admitted in 1967-68 had by August 1, 1968, either completed the GED test or were still enrolled and planning on taking the test in the future. Sixty-seven of the 91 (73.6 percent) admitted in 1968-69 had, by August 1, 1969, either completed the GED test or were still enrolled and planning on taking the test in the future.

Educational Activities of Those Who Completed the GED Test

It is of interest to note in the summaries below the subsequent educational activities of those HEP students who completed the GED test (38 of the 91 admitted to the HEP program in 1967-68 and 33 of the 91 admitted to the HEP program in 1968-69).

Of the 38 HEP students who had completed the GED test by August 1, 1968, there were 19 who were known to be continuing their education and 19 whose activities were unknown.

- The 19 known to be continuing their education were enrolled in the following institutions:

	1967-68	1968-69
University of Oregon	12	10
Lane Community College	3	3
Treasure Valley Community College	2	2
Business college (secretarial school)	2	2
Total	19	17

Of the 33 HEP students admitted into the HEP program in 1968-69 who had completed the GED test by August 1, 1969, 24 (72.7 percent) were known to be continuing their education at the time this information was secured (May-June 1969). Activities of nine were unknown.

	Number
Continuing their education	24
Number whose whereabouts and activities are unknown	9
Total	33

- The 24 known to be continuing their education were enrolled in the following institutions:

	1968-69
University of Oregon	21
Lane Community College	1
Barber school	1
Apprentice school, aluminum factory (California)	1
Total	24

Basis for Admission to HEP Students

Twenty-nine of the 33 HEP students who were admitted to the University of Oregon from the HEP program (12 from the 1967-68 group, 21 from the 1968-69 group, as shown above) were admitted on the basis of the recommendation of the director of the HEP program, since they were not admissible on the basis of high school grade point average (they had not graduated from high school) and they did not meet the University of Oregon requirements for admission on the basis of General Educational or Scholastic Aptitude test scores.

- Score on the GED test - The regular University of Oregon policy is to admit residents in the fall term on the basis of a GED average standard score of 55 on the five sub-tests constituting the GED test, and winter and spring terms with an average standard test score of 51, if the student scores a minimum of 40 on each of the five sub-tests. Nonresident students seeking admission to the University on the basis of GED test scores are required to have an average standard test score of 63 with a minimum score of 40 on each of the five sub-tests.

  Of the 33 HEP students admitted to the University (12 from the 1967-68 group, 21 from the 1968-69 group), 28 had average standard scores in the 40-50 range, one in the 51-55 range, two in the 56-60 range, and two scored above 61.

- Score on the Scholastic Aptitude test - For residents seeking admission to the University of Oregon on the basis of the Scholastic Aptitude test, a combined Scholastic Aptitude test score of 887 (of a possible combined total of 1,600 on the verbal and mathematics tests) is required for admission the fall term, 880 for winter or spring term. Only three of the 33 HEP students admitted into the University had scores of 887 or higher, and two of these three also had GED test scores high enough (average scores of 65 and 67) for regular admission on the basis of the GED test.

Grade Point Averages Earned Toward Degree

HEP students admitted to the University are required to maintain the same minimum grade point average for retention as students regularly admitted. Some indication of the scholastic performance of these students, insofar as performance is reflected in the cumulative grade point average is shown in TABLE XVII.

TABLE XVII

CREDITS EARNED AND CUMULATIVE GRADE POINT AVERAGES AT THE UNIVERSITY OF OREGON BY FORMER HEP STUDENTS

Terms Completed at University 1	Number HEP Students 2	Total Earned Degree Credit 3	Cumulative Grade Point Average 4
5	2	58	2.88
		59	3.01
4	7	38	3.31
		42	3.69
		44	3.52
		45	3.64
		50	3.42
		51	3.12
		54	3.28
3	5	14	3.66
		27	2.27
		33	2.58
		39	2.50
		41	3.23
2	5	3	4.00
		7	1.85
		12	3.00, 4.00
		21	3.36
1	13	0	0,0,0,0
		3	.90,2.00,3.00, 4.00
		5	1.66
		6	1.66,2.00,4.00
		12	3.25
0	1	-	-

Table XVII should read as follows. For example, the fourth item in the table indicates that five students (column 2) have completed two terms (column 1) of work, one each with 3, 7 and 21 hours of credit and two with 12 hours of credit (column 3) with GPA's as shown in column 4.

It will be seen from the aforementioned Table that, as one might anticipate, HEP students in the first few terms of enrollment at the University take lighter than normal loads, but by the time they have completed four or five terms of work they have completed sufficient hours of degree credit work to average 11-13 hours per term for total period of their enrollment. Thus, of the 13 HEP students who had completed only one term of work at the University by the close of the spring term 1968-69, 12 had earned 6 term hours of credit or less, with four having earned but 3 hours of credit. The same general pattern obtains for students with two terms completed. But those who have completed four or five terms are seen to have an average of 11-13 hours of credit over the total period of their enrollment.

BOOST Program

The University of Oregon BOOST program, like that of the other institutions, has, to the present, been a program designed solely for students who are economically disadvantaged, rather than for students who are academically disadvantaged. Hence, these students have been treated as are the general run of students from whom they are completely indistinguishable, except for their need for financial aid. Generally speaking, then, the institutions, including the University of Oregon, have maintained no special records on their achievement, beyond those normally maintained by the registrar's office. The data we present here relates to but a single year's BOOST students - those who were enrolled in 1968-69.

Fifty-six students enrolled in the University of Oregon through the BOOST program in 1968-69.

- Of these 56 students, 53 were Caucasian American, two were Black American and one American Indian.
- All were residents of Oregon.
- All were admissible under the regular admission standards of the university. Their high school grade point averages range from 2.00 to 4.00.

All 56 students were given financial aid in 1968-69, aggregating a total of $57,760 and divided as to form of aid as follows:

	Number Students Receiving Aid	Total Aid All Students
NDEA Loans	48	$24,176
Education Opportunity Grants	47	20,611
Work-Study Program	19	5,740
State Scholarships	16	4,312
State Cash Award	1	500
Institutional Grants	4	1,438
Guaranteed Students Loans	2	983
Total		$57,760

The source of the student financial aid was as follows:

	Amount
Federal Loans and Grants	$50,527
State System	4,812
Institutional Scholarships (other than state)	1,438
Loans other than NDEA (Guaranteed Loans)	983
Total	$57,760

Academic Achievement

- Forty of the 56 students admitted in 1968-69 completed three terms of work. Thirty-five of the 40 had cumulative grade point averages of 2.00 or above on cumulative earned credits ranging from 35 to 63 credit hours. Of this 35, 11 had grade point averages of 3.00 or above.

- Six of the 56 students had completed two terms. Three had grade point averages of less than 2.00 on cumulative earned credits ranging from 20 to 25 hours; two had grade point averages of 2.00 or above, and one, 3.55.

- Of the nine who completed but a single term, two had grade point averages of less than 1.00, three had more than 1.00 but less than 2.00, and four had 2.00 or more.

- One student entered but withdrew before the completion of a term's work.

Institutional Plans

The university plans to continue to work with the BOOST program in identifying qualified but financially disadvantaged students.